

HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ.

HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ,

OR

A COMMENTARY ON THE APOCALYPSE,

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL;

INCLUDING ALSO AN EXAMINATION OF
THE CHIEF PROPHECIES OF DANIEL.

ILLUSTRATED BY AN APOCALYPTIC CHART, AND ENGRAVINGS
FROM MEDALS AND OTHER EXTANT MONUMENTS
OF ANTIQUITY.

BY THE REV. E. B. ELLIOTT, A. M.

LATE VICAR OF TUXFORD, AND FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

SECOND EDITION,

CAREFULLY REVISED, CORRECTED, AND IMPROVED:

WITH AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING, BESIDES OTHER MATTER,

A SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF APOCALYPTIC INTERPRETATION.
AND INDICES.

VOL. II

SEELEY, BURNSIDE, AND SEELEY
FLEET STREET, LONDON
MDCCCLVI

“Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein : for the time is at hand.” Apoc. i. 3.

“The word of prophecy : whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn.” 2 Peter i. 19.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO VOL. II.

PART III.

CHAP.	PAGE
I. RETROSPECTIVE VIEW OF WESTERN CHRISTENDOM, FROM THE FALL OF CONSTANTINOPLE, UNDER THE SECOND OR TURKISH WOE, TO THE REFORMATION	1
II. COVENANT ANGEL'S DESCENT FULFILLED IN THE RE- FORMATION	37
III. EPOCH OF ANTICHRIST'S TRIUMPH JUST BEFORE THE REFORMATION	46
IV. § 1. REFORMATION BEGUN IN THE DISCOVERY OF CHRIST THE SAVIOUR	87
§ 2. REFORMATION ADVANCED IN THE DISCOVERY OF ANTICHRIST THE USURPER	101
V. THE ANGEL'S OATH	119
VI. § 1. REVIVAL OF GOSPEL-PREACHING	144
§ 2. ECCLESIASTICAL RE-FORMATION OF THE CHURCH	175
VII. THE WITNESSES. PREFATORY REMARKS	189
§ 1. THE WITNESSES AS DESCRIBED IN THE APOCALYP- TIC PROPHECY	194
§ 2. EARLIER WESTERN WITNESSES TRACED IN HIS- TORY	202
§ 3. EARLIER EASTERN OR PAULIKIAN WITNESSES	229
§ 4. JOINT MIDDLE-AGE WITNESSES	241
§ 5. THE PAULIKIANS TRUE CHRISTIAN WITNESSES	269
§ 6. THE WALDENSIAN EPOCH AND ORIGIN	306
§ 7. THE WALDENSES TRUE CHRISTIAN WITNESSES	338
VIII. PAPAL ANTI-WITNESS WAR, AND THE WITNESSES' DEATH AND RESURRECTION	356

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
IX. THE WITNESSES' ASCENSION	396
X. ENDING OF THE SECOND OR TURKISH WOE	421

APPENDIX.

NO.	PAGE
I. ON THE WORD <i>Δαιμονιον</i> , DEMON, APOC. IX. 20.	429
II. ON THE CHARGE OF MANICHEISM AGAINST THE PAULI- KIANs.	441
III. THE NOBLA LEYCON OF THE WALDENSES	462

PLATES TO VOL. II.

PLATE	PAGE
XIV. POPE LEO AS THE LION OF THE TRIBE OF JUDAH - - - - -	56
XV. LUTHER AS THE MONK AND THE PREACHER - - - - -	166
XVI. THE WALDENSIAN CANDLESTICK - - - - -	353
XVII. HUSS' MARTYRDOM AND PROPHECY - - - - -	394

ADDENDA.

PAGE

- 62, Add as sequel to Note 3; Compare with what has been above stated the exprest opinions of Ambrose Ansbert and Thomas Aquinas, given in Note 2 p. 98; asserting that this very pretension of *resembling the sun*, as the world's illuminator, would be a characteristic of Antichrist.
- 375, Add to Note 2. It may be well to observe that the correct reading of the Greek Text seems to be *ἐπι τῆς πλατειᾶς τῆς πολέως τῆς μεγαλῆς*, with the *τῆς* inserted before *πολέως*. So Tregelles, in his late elaborate and critical Edition of the Apocalyptic Text; it being so given alike in the Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Ephraemi, as well as many others. Hence the yet clearer identification of *the great city* here meant with *the city on the seven hills*, the Apocalyptic *Babylon*; mentioned under the same appellation. Apoc. xiv. 8, xvi. 19, xvii. 13, xviii. 10, 16, 18, 19, 21.

CORRIGENDA.

PAGE

- 14, Note 3, for 3 read 4.
- 43, line 9, dele *the comma* after Leo.
- 70, line 9 from bottom, for *forgiven* read *for given*.
- 90, line 16 from bottom, for *qui da* read *qui en*.
- line 21 from bottom, for *for* read *from*.
- 111, line 5, for *expended* read *appended*.
- 135, Note, for *Elæ* read *Elie*.
- 144, lin. 6 from bottom, for *Nihil* read *Niphul* of נִפְּחִל.
- 172, line 32, after *Sees*, insert *;—and line 42, after *Lyons*; insert)
- 176, In the Heading, for x. 8—11 read xi. 1, 2.
- 184, line 22, for *of the civil*, read *by the civil*.
- 188, In the Heading, for x. read xi.
- 195, for **†** read **‡**.
- 208, line 9 from bottom, for *Arites* read *Avitus*.
- 209, line 6, after *another* read *time*.
- 218, line 10 from bottom, for *plainly* read *probably*.
- 236, line 17, for *car-* read *car-*; and correct the numerals of the Notes.
- 243, Note 2, for 3 read 5.
- 246, Note 3, for 242, read 243.
- 279, Note 2, for 271 read 270.
- 306, Note 2, for 616 read 291.
- 332, Note 4, for 1 read 2.
- 378, Note 2, for *aut* read *suut*.
- 382, line 17, after *discern* insert *in it*.
- 385, lines 16 and 18, let *inserted* and *issued* change places.
- 411, and 443, In the Heading dele *Eastern*.

PART III.

—
APOC. IX. 20.—XI. 14.
—

THE REFORMATION,
AS OCCURRING
UNDER THE LATTER HALF OF THE SIXTH TRUMPET :
INCLUDING
THE ANTECEDENT HISTORY, AND THE
DEATH, RESURRECTION, AND ASCENSION
OF CHRIST'S TWO
WITNESSES.

—
A. D. 1453—1774.
—

CHAPTER I.

RETROSPECTIVE VIEW FROM AFTER THE FALL OF CONSTANTINOPLE OF THE PREVIOUS FOUR HUNDRED YEARS' HISTORY OF WESTERN CHRISTENDOM ; AND SKETCH OF ITS RELIGIOUS STATE IN THE ÆRA BETWEEN THAT EVENT AND THE REFORMATION.

“ AND the rest of the men, which were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the work of their hands, that they should not worship dæmons,¹ and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood, which can neither see, nor hear, nor walk. Neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sor-

¹ δαιμονια.

ceries, nor of their fornications, nor of their thefts.”—Apoc. ix. 20, 21.

What ! would the voice of the rod from heaven be still unheeded ? Would that astounding event, the political destruction of the Eastern third of Roman Christendom, by armies bearing onward with them from the Euphrates the false religion from the pit of the abyss, fail altogether to induce repentance and reformation in the remnant that was left ? So indeed it was here declared in the Apocalyptic vision ; and, at the same time, a catalogue of their sins in black array was set before the Evangelist.—The representation was one that would not strike upon his mind with effect so startling, as if no previous intimation had been given of their apostacy from their God and Saviour. Very early, we have seen, after the vision depicting the overthrow of Paganism, there had been foreshown to him by a significant figuration on the Apocalyptic temple-scene, the general abandonment of the Mediator Christ Jesus by the men of Roman Christendom : just as if other intercessors and mediators had been substituted in his place ; (for man must have some ;)—the first grand step to idolatry. Yet again, in the voice from the four horns of the golden altar, it had been foreshown to him that, up to the time of the loosing of the Euphratean woe, there had been no return to the Saviour whom they had abandoned, in any of the four quarters of the Roman world, no use of His offered means of reconciliation. All this was a preparative for what St. John now heard. And yet, even so, it must have seemed an awful announcement. “ The rest of the men,”—a phrase including possibly the christians of the *Greek* church, who though slain in their *corporate political capacity*, as the third part of men, still survived as *individuals* under the yoke of their Turkman conquerors, but doubtless chiefly and specially referring to the men of *western* Christendom,—“ The rest of the men, which were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they

should not worship dæmons, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood, which can neither see, nor hear, nor walk : neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornications, nor of their thefts.”—It is to the men of *western* Christendom that I shall in the present chapter confine myself, in the explanation of this passage. They constitute that division of the apostacy to which alone almost all that remains of the Apocalypse refers. Compared with the history and fate of her sister in the east, the case of the western Church, as here represented, resembled that of apostatizing Judah, after the fall of Israel, and indeed before it. In the antitype, as in the type, the treacherous Judah exhibited a guilt yet more unpardonable than that even of the backsliding Israel.¹

The announcement is twofold. 1st, It intimates the corruptions that *had been* in western Christendom during the progress previously of the second woe, up to the fall of the Greek empire ; for its non-repentance after that catastrophe implies the pre-existence of the evils unrepented of:—2. It declares the continuance of the same corruptions afterwards.—Under each of these divisions it is my duty to show, by historic facts, the truth of the prophecy. And,

Ist, *The prevalence of these corruptions that had been.*

Now considering that the period is a long one through which we are called to trace them, and one of course of many changes, it seems to me that it may be well to take in the first instance a brief *general* view of the cotemporaneous history of western Europe. We shall be thus prepared for entering more intelligently into the *particular* and *religious* view of it, here distinctively set before us. I the rather give it because the period itself, the “hour, day, month and year,” from A. D. 1057 to 1453, in the course of which the Turkish woe gathered,

¹ Jer. iii. 11.

advanced, receded,—then gathered and advanced again, —until at length it fulfilled its destined work of destroying the eastern or Greek empire, was one in many ways worthy of observation in the history of Christendom.

First, it is to be observed that, during this period of four centuries, the kingdoms that formed the constituency of what might now begin to be called the great *western confederation* of Europe, had been steadily, though slowly and interruptedly, recombining their *political* elements, consolidating their strength, and ere the xvth century closed in, (up to which epoch I shall just for the present include in my review,) re-adjusting their territorial forms and limits, to some near resemblance of those of the original Gothic kingdoms that emerged out of the ruins of the Roman empire of the west:—a form which in the main, I may add, they have retained ever since.—In a series of wars against their Mahomedan conquerors, the Christian remnant in *Spain* had in the earlier half of the period reconquered the greater part of the Peninsula; confining the Moors for a length of time within the straitened limits of the kingdom of Granada: and then at length, in the year 1492, under Ferdinand and Isabella, uniting their before divided strength, had conquered and expelled them altogether.—In the course of the same period the central *Frank* or *French* dynasty and kingdom had, gradually, one by one, again subordinated to itself the principalities broken off from it in its southern, western, northern, and eastern territory.—In similar manner *England*, after the Normans' conquest of it under William, (Thogrul Beg's cotemporary,) had become united in government throughout its own length and breadth, and had attached also to its dominions Wales and Ireland.—Thus alike aggrandized, there had begun between France and England that rivalry of above three centuries, which is one of the most marked features of their history in these middle ages; and in the prolonged wars of which, especially under the English Edwards and Henrys, they had, both the one and the other, developed rather than exhausted their national

resources.—The great elective *Germanic empire*, so famous under its Henry the Fowler and its Otho of the xth and xith centuries, after a partial diminution of strength and glory through its wars with the Romish Bishops and Italian and Swiss Republics, in the xiith, xiiith, and xivth centuries, had now at last, under the house of Austria,¹ assumed again an aspect of majesty and strength. It stretched to the east and to the north at this time, so as to include on the one hand the kingdoms of Hungary and Bohemia, and on the other Saxony and Pomerania, even to the Baltic, in its vast circuit. The strength of the hereditary kingdom of Austria more than compensated to it for what it had lost by the emancipation of Switzerland ; and moreover a nominal sovereignty still remained to it, and not a little of real influence, over the Lombard principalities in Northern Italy.—Finally as regards *Italy* itself,—Italy, the original seat of empire, and which still continued in a most singular manner to be the centre and spring of the European politics, very various in the same chronological interval had been the political phases passing over *it*. In its *northern* districts, for the first two centuries and more, the *Lombard cities* had fulfilled their brilliant course of republican life, and republican factions : and both *Pisa*, and *Genoa*, and *Venice*, had successively or coterminously, triumphed in the Mediterranean, and made their flags eminent in commerce and in war ; then one and all, excepting Venice, subsided into small and not independent principalities. To the *south*, i. e. in *Naples*, after the meteor-like rise and gradual fall of the chivalric Norman power in the xith and xiiith centuries, the right of sovereignty (still feudatorily however to the Pope, as under the Norman princes) had come to be alternately claimed and exercised by the royal branches of France and Spain ;—the fruitful germ of not far distant wars. Once more through *central* Italy, from sea to sea, the temporal sovereignty—not of the kings, the republic, or the emperors, but of the

¹ Maximilian was elected emperor, A. D. 1493.

bishops of Rome, had been about the middle of this period firmly established: so that this division in central Italy was now fully recognized in the European polity, as the *Ecclesiastical State*, or, as it was in part singularly called, the *Patrimony of St. Peter*.—Amidst all which changes in Italian history, in the course of these four centuries, two results could not but strike the considerate mind that reflected on them; *first*, the perpetual abortiveness of every scheme to bind the whole country together in one great secular monarchy, like the other European kingdoms; *secondly*, the sustained ascendancy over the other Italian powers of that of the Roman see.

Thus, I say, had the states of the great European confederations of the west, in a *political progression* seldom interrupted, been gradually advancing in power; and assuming somewhat of the same form and relative importance that they have borne since. And during their various processes of change and fortune they had, one and all, been advancing also from a state of barbarism to comparative *civilization*.—*Chivalry*, during its reign of two centuries, and with the Crusades from A. D. 1100 to A. D. 1300, as its most eminent field of display, had exercised an ameliorating influence of no little power on outward manners. *Internal trade*, and yet more *maritime commerce*,—the latter increasing until it might almost be said to have *flourished*, both to the north, in the German Sea and Baltic, and southward in the Mediterranean, specially with those countries of the east with which the Crusades had early and intimately connected the western merchants,—this commerce, I say, had not only augmented the general opulence of the community, but prepared and led to *civil liberty*: so that many *free towns* and *cities* had come to be established for the benefit of trade, alike in Italy, on the Baltic coast, along the rivers of Germany, in England also, and Spain, and in a measure in France.¹ And both in Eng-

¹ “As in the dawn of morning we distinguish from a summit of the Alps first the inferior mountains, then the lakes, towns, hills, and plains,—so in the xith century we first gain sight of the great reigning dynasties of Europe; soon after

land and France, Spain and Germany, *feudal servitude*, that relic of the Gothic and Frankic conquests, had gradually disappeared before it.

Meantime also the *intellectual energies* had been awakened from their long comparative slumber. Universities had in the xiith and xiiith centuries risen up in every country, and in every country been thronged with students; at Oxford and Cambridge, Paris and Montpellier, Bologna and Padua, Salamanca and Prague. And although for some long time,—notwithstanding the full course proposed of study in the arts, medicine, jurisprudence, theology,—in consequence of the scholastic philosophy prevailing, it was only the intellectual exercise that profited, and but little real light of science accrued to the associated students; yet, afterwards, in the days of Dante and Petrarch, in the xivth century, a fairer literature, and larger range of study and of thought, opened before them.—More especially in the earlier half of the xvth, after the *invention of printing* A. D. 1440, and when the scholars of Greece, with their books and their learning, were fleeing westward, in numbers more and more, for refuge from the impending ruin of their empire under the Turkish woe,—with the stores of ancient classic literature thus fully at length set before them, the western literati all eagerly pursued the study of it. Their ardor was that which is natural to the human mind on some new and vast discovery.

Yet once more, throughout the greater part of the period we speak of, *religious zeal* (if such it may be called) had been a feature in the character of these nations of the West, strongly marked and powerfully acting. The wars of the Crusades stand prominent on the military page of history, a singular and most remarkable memorial of it. And as memorials of it of a very different kind, but in their way scarcely less remarkable, there rose up those magnificent ecclesiastical structures of the

of particular illustrious families; and at length of the associations of burgesses, which gradually elevate themselves from the enslaved multitude." Müller's Univ. Hist. ii. 132. (Engl. Transl.)

middle ages, that still excite the admiration of the beholder, in England, France, Italy, and Germany. Certainly with those who raised them, religious zeal could not have been lukewarm.

But if it be asked,—and it is to this point that the apocalyptic prophecy, like the rest of the books of inspiration, specially and ever directs the attention,—if it be asked what the *character* of their *religion* now was, and whether advances had been made, during the progress of these four centuries, towards the recovery of those truths and of that moral purity of the religion of Jesus, which at their opening, as we have seen, had been so greatly lost,—the answer is altogether unsatisfactory. Notwithstanding the advance in the various kingdoms of the West towards political power, civil liberty, wealth, civilization,—notwithstanding the development of intellectual energy, the acquirements in literature, and widespread religious, or rather superstitious zeal, there is the indubitable testimony of the most authentic records of those middle ages to the fact that the religion prevalent was the grossest superstition ; and that it was accompanied by a grievous corruption of morals, as well as darkness of religious truth. Nor do I see how the whole could be better characterized than by that brief descriptive clause in the prediction before us, which speaks of the men that were not slain by the second woe as *worshipping dæmons*, and *idols* of gold and silver and brass and stone and wood ; and of their *fornications* also, and *sorceries*, and *thefts*, and *murders*.—Let us now, in respect of each of these points, examine and verify by historic fact.

And *first* as to the character of the *religious worship* prevalent through this long middle age, up to the time of the fall of Constantinople. It is described, in the opening clause of the verses before us, as that of “*dæmons*, and of *idols* of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood.”—In which statement it is the word *dæmons* that first demands notice. And used as the term was in St. John’s time, in the current literature of

the Roman world, to signify those fictions of men's fancy *the heathen gods*, and adopted as *that* use of it had been in the Holy Scriptures,—at the same time that the more frequent New Testament application of it to the *spirits that possessed dæmoniacs* suggested the fearful fact of *living malignant spirits* acting, though unsuspected, in the heathen system,¹—I say, since such was the double use of the term in the apostle's time, what could he reasonably infer from the declaration here made but this;—that there would have prevailed through the times referred to, and been established in the professing but apostatized Church of Western Christendom, a system of *dæmonolatry*, the counterpart (albeit under the Christian name) of that of heathen Greece or Rome:—a fact for which (as already observed) the early Apocalyptic notice of the abandonment of Christ's mediators and propitiation would have prepared him. More particularly that it would be one in which imaginary beings would be the objects worshipped, and for the most part *the spirits of dead men deified*; that they would be characterized in their worshippers' fancy by about as much, or as little, of *moral virtue* as the gods of the heathen heaven before them; that they would be supposed to fulfil to their suppliants, just like the latter, the offices of *mediators* and *guardian-spirits*; that thus, false as it was and antichristian, the system would as truly be an emanation from hell as its precursor, and one in which *malignant hellish spirits* would as truly be the suggesters, actors, and deceivers.—Such, I say, would, as it seems to me, appear to be the intent of the predictive clause under discussion, construed according to the recognized scriptural meanings of the word *dæmon*.—And of the *fulfilment* of the prophetic declaration, thus

¹ In the prophetic controversies of late years the true meaning of the word *δαίμονια*, both here and in 1 Tim. iv. 1, and the propriety of its application to the *canonized saints* of the Greek or Roman calendars, has been sometimes called into question; especially by Mr. Maitland. The importance of the point in itself, and the strength of the assertions made against the propriety of this application of it, render necessary a more extended notice of the subject than could be properly given in a Note. I have therefore placed it in the Appendix at the end of this Volume; commending it however to the Reader's attentive perusal.

far, what well-informed Protestant is ignorant? The Decrees of the 7th General Council, which authorized and established the worship¹ of the saints and their images, were fully in force throughout the period I speak of: and by necessity more and more superseded all spiritual worship of the one God, through the one Mediator Jesus Christ. The parallel between the deified dead men of heathenism and these deified dead men of apostate Christendom, especially as believed in and worshipped through this middle age, held in respect of *character*, (*flagitious character*,²) and *offices*, as well as of *origin*.—Nor must I omit to notice the similarity of *worship*, as in neither case confined to the abstractions of mental contemplation, but offered through the medium (as the prophecy further added, and as was sure to follow,) of visible *images*;³ or on the similar *variety*, in respect of material and value, in the *idols* of either system, and the consequent adaptation

¹ The very same term for *worshipping* them, viz. *προσκυνεω*, is here used, that was the one adopted in the 7th General Council, to designate the worship of the saints specifically enjoined by it, in contradistinction to *λατρευω*.

² In regard of their similar *vindictiveness*, *warlike propensities*, and *thirst of blood*, the Albigensian and Waldensian crusades, the Inquisition, &c. &c. already alluded to, furnish more than sufficient evidence. For more on this point see Southey's *Vindic. Eccl. Angl.* p. 459, &c.: and in regard of their similar *favourableness to impurity*, Note 2 page 12 *infra*. See too my Paper on *δαιμονιον* in the Appendix.—I must beg especial attention to this point. *Saints* they were called: but *saints* they were not.

³ Mr. Maitland, the able and learned advocate of the "Dark Ages," (a period defined by him to extend in vulgar acceptation from A. D. 800 to 1200,) admits this, at p. 75 of his Work bearing that Title, with reference to the *latter half* at least of the period I have here under review. For in a notice of certain customary offerings to the *patron-saints* of churches and monasteries in the 9th and 10th centuries, he thus specifies and reprobates evils afterwards following: "The superstition of the age supposed the glorified saint to know what was going on in the world; and to feel a deep interest, and possess a considerable power, in the church militant on earth. I believe they who thought so were altogether mistaken; and I lament, abhor, and am amazed at the superstitions, *blasphemies*, and *idolatries*, which have grown (i. e. *subsequently*) out of that opinion."

He adds: "As to the notion itself I do not know that it was wicked; and I almost envy those whose credulous simplicity so realized the *communion of saints*, (*saints!*) and anticipated the period when the whole family in heaven and earth shall be gathered together in one." A passage which I dare not pass over without expressing my deep regret that Mr. M. should have written it; and solemnly cautioning the reader against being led by it to any idea of the innocency of such superstitious views about *departed saints*, as held in the earlier half of the dark ages. It was a view which, *by their substitution*, virtually displaced *Christ* from his office of *man's mediator*, *intercessor*, and *propitiation*; just as allusively intimated in that wonderful figuration of the incense-offering, depicted with reference to the exact epoch when this superstition began: (see Vol. i. p. 305, &c.) and displaced him too from his office as the Christian's *ever-present*,

of the Christian, as of the Pagan idolatry, to the circumstances of every rank in society. “Idols of *gold*, and *silver*, and *brass*, and *stone*, and *wood*.” The fact in this point, as in every other, answered precisely to the prophecy. And thus houses as well as churches,—the street-corners and the highways,—the cabins of the poor and the palaces of the rich,—had severally their images of suitable material: and before them, through the times spoken of, high and low, rich and poor, laics and ecclesiastics, did all, in contempt of God’s command, just as their pagan forefathers,² alike bow down and worship.

ever-watching guardian and guide. A sin surely with no common measure of guilt and ingratitude attaching to it! From which time the system of *saint-invocation* never intermitted; became soon the system of *saint-worship*, προσκυνησις δαιμωνων, as here stated; and then next, worship of their *images*.—In Mr. M.’s own list (p. 76) of sacred offerings in these ages the form is, “Deo, et sanctissimo martyri Bonifacio;”—“Creatori omnium, et gloriosissimo martyri Juliano;”—“Creatori Deo, necnon Sancto Martino Domino meo gloriosissimo, quem toto affectu diligo;” &c.—Thus, though *Christ* was acknowledged to be *God*, (nor indeed, as we shall see, could the system of the Papal Antichrist have been perfect without it,) yet *Christ* the *God-man*, the *Mediator*, was virtually superseded and denied, just as much as by the earlier Gnostics:—until at length the Papal anti-christian apostacy, having come to its acme about A. D. 1200, found out an excellent place within itself for the *God-man* *Christ*, through its doctrine of *transubstantiation*: of which there will appear at p. 57 a striking illustration.

See in corroboration the *Chronicle of Brakelond*, a monk of St. Edmund’s Bury in the twelfth century, just published by the *Cambridge Camden Society*: the translator of which, Mr. Tomlin, thus writes: “Through the whole of the *Chronicle our Saviour’s* name is never once mentioned. *God* and *St. Edmund* is a phrase of common occurrence. Indeed nothing short of a narrative of this description could fully develop the depravation of the Christian religion by means of *saint-worship*.”—Is not our Church’s Homily more correct, as well as more authoritative, than Mr. Maitland, in making the *idolatry* of Christendom to have extended back full 800 years before the Reformation, and characterizing it as *dammable*?

¹ Fleury, speaking of Serenus of Marseilles, observes that all the ancient images were wooden, “images de bois.”—In the other materials mentioned there is a curious evidence of the *Latins* being particularly intended in this prophetic notice. The Greek Church allows of *pictures*, as *unsubstantial*; but anathematizes bowing before *statues*, as idolatry. Μεγαλη διαφορα ειναι, says Ricaut, chap. i. 17, αναμεσα των ειδωλων και των εικονων. I quote from Waddington on the Greek Church, p. 59.

In the year 1215 *deified bread* was added to the other material objects of worship, by Innocent III; who then, in the 4th Council of Lateran, authoritatively enjoined the doctrine of *transubstantiation*.—However as this was not a *saint*, but supposed however erroneously to be *Christ*, its worship was not *dæmonolatry*.

² A Romanist generally disclaims the charge of idolatry with indignation.—He should remember that the arguments he uses in support of his disclaimer, are just such as would be used by a Cicero, a Varro, or a Julian, in explanation and defence of *their* idolatrous worship; as looking through the idols to God.

It is unfortunate for the Romanist and Greek apostates, that authorities most dissentient on other points should unite in taking this view of their worship. The ancient *Pagans* (if I remember rightly a passage in Julian) charged the

If, in connection with this its superstition and idolatry, the *morals* meanwhile of western Europe be enquired of, the answer is given in another emphatic word that we find in the predictive statement before us; which tells of “their *fornications*.”—He who is at all acquainted with the history of the middle ages, must be aware of the almost universal licentiousness then prevailing, most of all with the clergy. Historians and poets, ballads and acts of councils,¹ alike testify to the fact. Nor let it be unobserved, as being perhaps meant to be intimated by the juxta-position and intimate association of the words in the prophetic clause, that this licentiousness was not only the *accompaniment*, but the *effect*, of the superstition prevalent. It was in many ways,—I might indeed almost say in every way,—that immorality and vice were fostered by it. The notions entertained of the *character* of some even of the most eminent of the *saints* worshipped, just as of those of the heathen deities in ancient times, acted as an incentive, rather than preventive, to sins of impurity.² The system of *indulgences*, according

apostatizing Christians, even in the 4th century, with idolatry, viz. of the Cross. The Mahomedan *Saracens* and *Turks* charged them with it subsequently. In Christendom, *Protestants* do the same; including even learned *Infidels*, e.g. Gibbon. Finally the *Jews* add their consenting testimony; both the more ancient Jews, as Maimonides; and the moderns also. Mr. Nicolayson, I am told, wrote a few years since an account of a Jew converted to Christianity at Jerusalem, who was afraid to avow himself a Christian, for fear of his being considered and killed by his brethren as an *idolater*. (See Jewish Report for 1835, p. 40.)—Since then we may be thankful that the Protestant Church of England has begun to be known at Jerusalem: and through it the fact, so long unknown to eastern Jews, that to be a Christian and a worshipper of idols is not identical.

¹ “If you wish to see the horrors of those ages,” (the middle ages) says Chateaubriand, *Disc. Hist.* Tom. iii. 420, “read the *Councils*.”—Mr. Maitland allows this in a measure (*Dark Ages*, p. 33;) and I must say, that having looked into the Councils with this object, myself, the evidence of the immoral character of the priesthood seems to me irresistible. With reference to the ixth and xth centuries, I have spoken in an earlier Chapter. (See Vol. i. p. 442.) With reference to the five following see, for an illustration, Note 2. p. 14.

² On this point let me give Mr. Hallam’s testimony; (*Middle Ages*, iii. 347.)—“That the exclusive worship of saints, under the guidance of an artful though illiterate priesthood, degraded the understanding, and begot a stupid credulity and fanaticism is sufficiently evident. But it was also so managed as to loosen the bonds of religion, and pervert the standard of morality. If these inhabitants of heaven had been represented as stern avengers, accepting no slight atonement for heavy offences, and prompt to interpose their control over natural events for the detection and punishment of guilt, the creed... might have proved a salutary check on a rude people, and would have had the only palliative that can be offered for a religious imposture,—its political expediency. In the legends of these times

to which sins of this class might at a very cheap rate be atoned for and pardoned, confirmed men in the light notions prevailing of their guilt and evil.¹ The very *pilgrimages* that were enjoined so frequently in the middle age, as one kind of *penance for sin* and means to its remission, being enjoined to all of both sexes at the same time and to the same place, were notoriously the occasion of immorality on the largest scale.² The compulsory *celibacy of the clergy*, a rule enforced under the strongest penalties throughout the Romish church, from the time of Gregory VII, downward, as also that of the monks and nuns, involved, as it was sure to do, the depravation, both among and around them, alike of the outward morals and of the heart :³ not to add the fact of the regular episcopal *licensing of fornication* among the priesthood, already noted with reference to an earlier

on the contrary,"—and then Mr. Hallam gives specimens of the current legends concerning the saints, abundantly confirmatory of his statement; adding, that the general character of religious notions prevailing, are best known from these popular compositions.—Besides these, let the reader, who has the opportunity, consult also the stories in the Golden Legend;—a work of which, we read, such was the popularity in the 15th century, that Panza enumerates upwards of seven editions in the *Latin*, (the language most used by priests,) eight in *Italian*, fourteen in *Dutch*, five in *German*, three in *French*. So Ames Typogr. Antiq. i. 190.

One is reminded by these legends of Ovid's celebrated lines, on the incentive to vice in the immoral character of the *Pagan* deities; Trist. ii. 287.

Quis locus est templis augustior? 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 hanc doluisse deam : &c.

¹ In the Pontificate of John XXII, about 1320 A. D. there was invented the celebrated Tax of Indulgences, of which more than forty editions are extant. *Incest* was to cost, if not detected, *five groschen*; if known or flagrant, *six*. A certain price was affixed similarly to *adultery*, *infanticide*, &c. See Merle D'Aubigne's Reformation; Vol. i. p. 41. The same is noticed by Robertson, and in Mendham's Index Expurg.—"Instead of causing men to dread sin, these Indulgences encourage them to wallow therein as hogs." So Wicliff; Le Bas, p. 329.

² Hallam, Middle Ages, iii. 357. "This licensed vagrancy," he says, "was naturally productive of dissoluteness." So too Mills on the Crusades: chap. i.—Compare Vol. i. p. 306. Note 2.

³ For the state of the nunneries in Rome in A. D. 1347, see Life and Times of Rienzi, p. 27.—In the next century, the 15th, for an account of their state generally through western Christendom, no more unimpeachable authorities could be cited than *Gerson*, the French orator, so celebrated at the Council of Constance, and *Clemangis*, a French theologian, also cotemporary, and of great eminence. The former called them, "*Prostibula meretricum*." The latter thus speaks of them: "*Quid aliud sunt hoc tempore puellarum monasteria, nisi quædam non dico Dei sanctuaria, sed Veneris execranda prostibula: ut idem sit hodie puellam*

age¹, and which continued through these four centuries,² indeed, it will appear, still later.³ And the practice of *auricular confession*,—a practice recommended and fostered, as we have seen,⁴ by the Popes from early times, but which was for the first time authoritatively enjoined as an integral and necessary part of the Romish religion, in the 4th *Lateran Council*, A. D. 1215,—that “damnable system of the confessional,” as it has been called in its late exposure,⁵—I say this practice of auricular confession, besides its other appalling evils, made the tainting of the female mind an integral part of Romish priestcraft, and gave consecration to the communings of impurity.⁶

If it be asked, again, how a system of religion could be admitted and believed in, so monstrous and so opposed, not to the spirit of the Bible only, but even to the moral sense of the natural conscience, we may remind the reader, first, that the religion of the Bible was then too generally unknown: next, that the complacency of the natural corruption in a religion in many ways so suited to it, was sure with the larger number to dull the moral sense, and still the misgivings of conscience.—But, besides this, he who would understand the general credence yielded to it, must never forget the lying *sorceries* with which, as here also preintimated, the priests in those dark ages supported it. Just as in every country where *heathen* idolatry has been established, the priesthood have, alike in ancient and in modern times, had their magical deceits, wherewith to work on the credulity of a superstitious people, so it was in those middle ages with the

velare, quod et publicè ad scortandum exponere.” I quote from Hallam, iii. 353. Let me add that Clemangis was Doctor of the Sorbonne; and a writer as eminent for candour and integrity, as for learning. See Mosheim, xv. 2. 2. 24.

Compare a similar statement given respecting the ninth century, Vol. i. p. 442.

¹ Vol. i. p. 442 Note 4.

² See the Council of Paris, Canon 13, held A. D. 1212; the 4th Lateran Canon 14, held 1215; Clemangis’ statement presented to the Council of Constance, held 1414; (and which is given in Waddington, p. 550;) also the Canon of the Council of Basle, held 1432, which was transcribed and repeated by that of Sens, held A. D. 1485.

³ See p. 26 Note 3 *infra*.

⁴ Vol. i. p. 380.

⁵ Especially by the Rev. R. M’Ghee.

⁶ *Dens* is by no means singular in his abominations.—I have seen somewhat of the same in a *Sacerdotium Missale*, printed in Italy.

priests of the *Romish church*; ¹ even as also since, indeed, in proportion as the ignorance prevailing might allow of the practice. Who that is acquainted with its history, knows not of the impostures through which miracles were, through all this long period, assured to have been wrought, whether by the priests themselves directly, or yet more by the relics or images of saints, the priests' puppets: ²—images “which could neither see, nor hear, nor walk;” but which were yet asserted, and believed, to be possessors of human senses, ³ and to exercise the power of making the lame to walk, restoring sight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf? ⁴ Who knows not of the pretended but lying visions related by priests of what was passing in purgatory; ⁵ and of the effect of the masses, prayers, and indulgences, purchased for their relief on the souls suffering in it? “It must not be supposed,” says Mr. Hallam, “that these absurdities were produced by ignorance. In most cases they were the work of deliberate imposture.” They were the *φαρμακεια*, ⁶ the *sorcery*

¹ The sorceries of the *heathen* priests in Egypt and Babylon are figured as *Pagan Rome's* counter parts in the *Apocalypse*.

² On the tricks and sorceries of *Romish pseudo-christian* priests, see *Southey's Book of the Church*, pp. 173, 277.—*Wicliff* mercilessly exposed them, as also *Huss* after him. As an example from the latter, in character somewhat singular, I may instance his Treatise “against the impostures of covetous priests. . . who put their own blood into the host, to make fools believe that it is the blood of Christ.” *L'Enfant*, *Hist. of Council of Constance*, p. 27. (Eng. Transl. 1730.)

³ “*Nostri fabulatores*,” says *Laurentius Valla*, “*passim inducunt idola loquentia; quod ipsi Gentiles, et idolorum cultores, non dicunt.*” Similar was the case of the crucifix at *Boxley*, mentioned in *Bishop Burnet's* account of the suppression of monasteries under *Henry VIII*; which was famous for moving its head, hands, and feet, rolling its eyes, &c.

⁴ As an example of the *saints'* thus miracle-working, take the following. In *A. D. 1305*, *King Edward I.* was prevailed on by his clergy to write to *Pope Clement V.*, to canonize *Thomas de Cantelupe*, bishop of *Hereford*, because a multitude of miracles had been wrought by his influence:—“*intantum*,” says the king, “*quod, ipsius meritis et intercessionibus gloriosus, lumen cæcis, surdis auditus, verbum mutis, gressus claudis, et alia pleraque beneficia, ipsius patrocinium implorantibus cælesti dextrâ conferuntur.*” *Fædera*, Vol. I. p. 976, Ed. 1816.

I know nothing which more strikingly exhibits the unblushing impudence and coolness of these priestly falsehoods and sorceries, than the statement laid down by the celebrated *Roman casuist Veron*, that it is not an *article of faith* with *Roman Catholics* that the bones and relics belong to those whose names are attached to them. (See the *English Translation* by *Mr. Waterworth*.) While yet it is simply in virtue of each such particular *saint's* personal merit that the miracles, as the worshipper is told, are wrought!!

⁵ See my brief sketch of the progress and establishment of the doctrine of purgatory, Vol. i. p. 377, &c.

⁶ Compare *Apoc. xviii. 23.*

ries, whereby to stupify and to charm, specified both here and elsewhere in the Apocalypse, as one of the deadly unrepented sins of Papal Rome :—that great city which is spiritually called Egypt and Babylon ; and which was indeed, though under a christian name, the very representative in this respect, as well as others, of heathen Egypt, and heathen Babylon before it.

But *wherefore* did the priesthood and the monks, the bishops and the popes, thus with one consent deceive ? Another of the characteristic words in the clause we are considering, points out the master-motive : “ They repented not of their *thefts*.”—No doubt *ambition* and *pride* operated with most in the higher stations, indeed with more than the high ones in the priesthood ;¹ and again, with many a dark blind *superstition* : but the *love of money*, that root of all evil, operated with all. Hence the value fraudulently assigned to *relics* : of which (just as in the time of Gregory I, and even before it,) the demand and the supply were incessant through the dark ages in western Christendom !² Hence the exaltation of this and that *saint's* miracle-working merit, in order to draw deluded votaries to make their pecuniary offerings at the shrine ; and the canonization of *new* saints, and dedication of new images, when the interest of the old was worn out.³—Hence the invention and sale of *indulgences*, first by the bishops, alike to clergy and people ; afterwards, in the 12th century, by the popes as a papal monopoly : through the which, in virtue of a sufficient money-payment, not the *temporal* penance only, due to sin, but even the *eternal* punishment was now declared

¹ See the early progress of this noted, Vol. i. p. 379 *suprà*.

² I have referred long since (Vol. i. p. 305) to Augustine's early denunciation of this practice. It was only a specimen of what increased continually afterwards, even to the period under review. So, for example, Mosheim xii. 2. 3. 3 in his ecclesiastical sketch of the 12th century, observes ; “ The abbots and monks carried about the country the carcasses and relics of saints, in solemn procession ; and permitted the multitude to behold, touch, and embrace, the sacred remains at fixed prices.”

³ “ Every cathedral or monastery had its tutelar saint, and every saint his legend ; fabricated in order to enrich the churches under his protection ; by exaggerating his virtues and his miracles, and consequently his power of serving those who paid liberally for his patronage.” Hallam iii. 346.

to be remitted.¹—Hence the prescription of *pilgrimages*, as an act of penance, to shrines of smaller note, or greater, and to be performed on a larger scale or less, individually or in multitudes; ²—above all, of pilgrimage to *Rome*, on the gigantic scale of the *Jubilee*. The which latter institution, first invented and promulgated by Pope Boniface VIII, in the year 1300, as in lieu of crusades to Jerusalem,³ was responded to eagerly by all western Europe; the enactment being that each 100th

¹ *Wicliff* (partially quoted Note 1 p. 13) declared that Indulgences were mere forgeries, whereby the Priesthood “*rob men of their money*; a subtle merchandize of Antichrist’s clerks, whereby they magnify their own fictitious power, and instead of causing men to dread sin, encourage men to wallow therein as hogs.”

See Merle D’Aubigne’s *History of the Reformation*, Vol. i. p. 39, &c., for a sketch of the progressive history of Indulgences. It began, he says, under John the Faster, Archbishop of Constantinople. The priests said, “O penitents, you are unable to perform the penances we have imposed upon you. Well, then, we the priests of God will take on ourselves this heavy burden. Who can better fast than we? Who better kneel and recite Psalms?” But the labourer is worthy of his hire. The priestly substitute must be *paid*.—Then, after a while, the *Pope*, the High Priest of Christendom, perceived the advantage derivable from the system. Alexander De Hales, in the 13th century, invented the doctrine necessary to secure the advantage to the papacy. *Supererogatory works* had been done by Christ and the saints; a *supererogatory merit* attached to them: of all which the guardianship and distribution was confided to the Vicar of Christ. Thomas Aquinas confirmed the doctrine, and applied it to the state of the dead in purgatory. A Bull of Clement VII made it an *article of faith*.—Then came under John XXII the famous *Tax of Indulgences*, already alluded to p. 14; and just before it, in 1300, the *Jubilean Bull* of Boniface VIII, (of which more presently,) with its promises of plenary indulgence.—So that well might Leo the Xth utter afterwards the well known speech, that Mr. Birks has cited in his Book on Daniel, p. 233; “How profitable this fable of Jesus Christ has been to us!”

See also on this subject Muratori *Antiq. M. Æ.* Tom. v. Dissert. 68.—Copies of Indulgences are common. One of the 16th century is given by Waddington, p. 690, and will be illustrated in my chapter iii following. In a later part of my work a fac-simile will appear of one of the 17th century; the original of which is in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge.

² e. g. the pilgrimages in *Italy* to our Lady of Loretto, in *Spain* to St. James of Compostella. That to the shrine of *Thomas a Becket* will readily occur to the reader as an *English* illustration. Through his reputation Canterbury became the little Rome of England. A Jubilee was celebrated each 50th year in his honor, with plenary indulgence to such as visited his tomb; of whom 100,000 have been registered at a time. Two large volumes were filled, says Gervase of Canterbury, with accounts of the miracles wrought at his tomb. And the following lists of the value of offerings made on two successive years to *his* shrine, the *Virgin Mary’s*, and *Christ’s*, in the cathedral church there, will well illustrate both what is here stated of the gains to the priesthood from these pilgrimages, and of the effectiveness of the new dæmonolatry to efface regard and remembrance of Christ. The lists are taken from Dr. Middleton’s *Letters from Rome*, p. 128.

FIRST YEAR.	£	s.	d.	NEXT YEAR.	£	s.	d.
Christ’s altar	3	2	6	Christ’s altar	0	0	0
Virgin Mary’s	63	5	6	Virgin Mary’s	4	1	8
Becket’s	832	12	9	Becket’s	954	6	3

³ Ferrario (ii. 433) says that Boniface borrowed his idea from the centenary

year, and afterwards each 50th and each 33rd, in virtue of a pilgrimage to Rome, and visitation of its churches, every sin was to be cancelled to the pilgrim, and his salvation ensured.¹—Hence the assurance to the dying man of forgiveness and salvation, in case of *testamentary bequests* to the church or monastery.² Hence, after his death, the tales to surviving relatives of the efficacy of *masses for the dead*, and of indulgences bought by survivors, to free the soul from *purgatory*.³—To which might be added, within the church itself, the long established

secular festivals of ancient heathen Rome: also that the Jubilean pilgrims “chiamansi *Romei*, in quanto vanno à Roma.”

¹ The venality of Rome is *early* celebrated. So in the 10th century by Arnulph, bishop of Orleans; who calls Rome, “a venal city, which weighs all its decrees by the quantity of money.” This was at a time preceding the 400 years under review.—And from after the commencement of the Jubilees, in consequence of priestly appeals to the people of Christendom, and of their superstitious veneration of the spot, “the Vatican and the capitol were,” as Gibbon says, (xii. 262,) “nourished by incessant and increasing swarms of pilgrims and supplicants.” The Jubilee was indeed a happy contrivance, to ensure a vast periodical increase of a supply already habituated to flow to it.

In the Jubilee of 1300, Muratori relates the result as follows: “Papa innumerabilem pecuniam ab iisdem recepit; quia die et nocte duo clerici stabant ad altare Sancti Pauli, tenentes in eorum manibus rastellos, rastellantes pecuniam infinitam.” Hallam ii. 322.

Of the Jubilee next following, that of 1350, Matt. Villani says; “The concourse was such, that between Christmas and Easter there were 1,200,000 foreigners at Rome: the places of those who returned home being supplied by new comers. Between Ascension and Whitsunday there were 800,000 more: and notwithstanding the heat of the summer, there was scarce a day during the season but 200,000 foreigners were seen at Rome.” Life of Rienzi, p. 167.

(It was in his Bull appointing this Jubilee of 1350, that Clement VI, in reference to pilgrims who might die on their journey to Rome, used the blasphemous language; “We absolutely command the angels, that they place his soul in paradise, entirely exempt from purgatory.” Waddington, 689.)

In that of 1450 an eye-witness, says Ranke, (Hist. of Popes i. 37,) describes them as coming like swarms of bees, or flights of migratory birds:—indeed the concourse was such that many were crushed to death. Waddington, p. 625.

² In Wicliff’s time there were in England 53215 feoda militum: of which the religious had 28,000; i. e. more than half. Le Bas’ Wicliff, p. 131, from Turner’s History of England, ii. 413.—Blackstone says, that but for the intervention of the Legislature and the Statute of Mortmain, the church would have appropriated in this manner the whole land in England: iv. 107.

³ So gainful was the *death* of members of wealthy families in this manner to the priests, that *Huss*, in his reproaches of their avarice (about 1400 A. D.) framed the Latin line in proverbial form against them;

De morbo medicus gaudet; de morte sacerdos.

See L’Enfant, Hist. of Council of Constance, p. 36; &c.

In this denunciation of the avarice of the Priesthood, *Wicliff*, as is well known, was *Huss*’ energetic predecessor. He particularly accuses the Clergy of inventing *purgatorial pains* horrible and shameful, in order to make men pay a vaster ransom. Le Bas p. 327 &c. So also, about 1350, *Juan Ruiz* in Spain. See M’Crie’s Reform. in Spain, p. 58.

system of the *sale and purchase of ecclesiastical dignities* from Rome: ¹ and the episcopal *licences of fornication*, regularly granted to the priesthood century after century, as we have seen, at a *money-price*.²—But indeed on this subject, having once begun, where shall we end?

There is yet another heavy charge against Western Christendom, during “the hour, and day, and month, and year,” in the predictive verse before us;—the charge of *murders*. Need I explain to the reader, how exactly this answers also to the facts of the ecclesiastical history of Western Europe during the latter half of these four centuries? He will be aware, no doubt, how from early in the 12th century a few, congregationally or individually, began to teach more openly, what had never indeed been altogether untestified, a purer doctrine:—a doctrine derived not from priestly legends, or from the schools, not from the decrees of Popes or Councils, or from any books of human literature, but from a book, now all but forgotten, if not unknown, not by the laity only, but by most too both of monks and of the clergy,—the *Book of the Holy Scriptures*.³ The moral excellence and innocency of these Waldenses is, for the most part, confessed even by their enemies. And with written authority

¹ For example Matthew Paris mentions that in the twelfth century, in the reign of Henry I, a sum equal perhaps to £10,000 was paid to Rome by the Archbishop of York for his pall.—Again A. D. 1376 the “good Parliament,” under Edward III, remonstrated against Papal exactions; saying, “that the taxes paid to the Pope of Rome for ecclesiastical dignities do amount to fivefold as much as the taxes of all profits that appertain to the King by the year of his whole realme.” Ann. 50, Edward III, Tit. 94. ² See p. 14 Note 2 *suprà*.

³ P. Waldo translated the Scriptures out of Latin into the Romance. This, I believe, was the first nearly complete translation yet made into the vernacular French; (smaller portions had been translated before:) and introduced *his* attempt at reformation.—In England, where the old Anglo-Saxon translations had for centuries been obsolete, and an incomplete anonymous one of 1290 (see Horne’s *Introduc.* ii. 241, and *Le Bas’ Wiclif*, 218—231,) almost unknown, Wiclif, about a century later, made his into English.—The enormous prices of Bibles, however, in those times, was almost a prohibition to general diffusion. In England in 1274 the price of a Bible, with a commentary, fairly written was £30; the equivalent to 15 years labour of a labouring man, as the daily wages were then 1½*d.* And still in 1429 Wiclif’s *New Testament* sold for £2. 16*s.* 8*d.*, worth £30 now perhaps. So *Le Bas* p. 241, and Townley, in his *Biblical Anecdotes*.

Mr. Maitland in his “*Dark Ages*,” p. 202, observes on the necessary expensiveness of a copy of the whole Bible, before the discovery of printing: as, at the rate at which law-stationers pay their writers, a fair copy would probably *now* cost £60 or £70 for the writing only, and occupy the writer perhaps ten months.

for their doctrines so unquestionable, with the internal evidence of its own excellence confirming, and the innocency of their lives recommending it,—it might surely have been hoped, that not the general attention only, but the general favor, would have been conciliated towards it and them ; the partial opening and almost re-discovery to the French laity of the Book of God hailed with joy ; and a foundation laid, in its knowledge and study, for a real and general amelioration of morals. Indeed of this, what read we ? The Book itself was quickly denounced by Pope and priesthood, and partially suppressed.¹ And against *them* the cry of *heretics* was raised ; and their

¹ “Tertia causa (propagationis Waldensium) est Veteris ac Novi Testamenti in vulgarem linguam ab ipsis facta translatio.” So Richinius Dissert. de Waldensibus : adding that Innocent III charged on the Bishop and Chapter at Metz to inquire who had made the translation, and with what object. This was in 1199. And the result is stated in Alberic’s Chronicle, on the year 1200, as the *burning* by the priests of the translated books : “In Urbe Metensi, pullulante sectâ Waldensium, directi sunt quidam Abbates ad prædicandum : qui quosdam libros de Latino in Romanum versos combusserunt.”

Mr. Maitland states, at p. 221 of his *Dark Ages*, as the result of his researches into the literature of that extended period (from 800 to about 1200) that “he knows of nothing which should lead him to suppose that any human craft or power was exercised to prevent the reading, multiplication, or diffusion of the word of God.” But it must be observed that Mr. M.’s researches refer to *monastic* bodies, or the *clerical* order, and to the *Latin Bible* almost entirely : in regard of which and whom Mr. M.’s statement may be substantially correct. It was in regard of *translations* for the *laity*, and when, as the result of reading them, the laity came to see something different in religion from the doctrines of the priests and papacy, that the trial of principle arose. And what then ? Says Sismondi, in his *Albigensian Crusade*, p. 226, as the heretics supported their doctrine by the authority of Holy Scripture, the first indication of heresy at that time (soon after 1200 A. D.) was considered to be the citation of either the epistles or gospels.—In 1229 the Council of Thoulouse prohibited the laity from possessing the Scriptures. So again, about 1270, James I, King of Arragon, passed a law that whoever possessed any of the Books of the Old or New Testament in the Romance or vulgar tongue, and did not bring them to the Bishop to be burned, should be considered suspected of heresy. (Townley).—About 1400 the Decree of Pope Alexander V, which condemned all translations into the vulgar tongues, caused the suppression to be more decided and universal through western Christendom. In England, for example, Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, now decreed in convocation, that neither Wicliff’s translation, nor any other in the English tongue, should be read till approved by the Bishop ; and several persons were burned, as appears from bishops’ registers, for refusing compliance, and reading Wicliff’s translation. (Gray’s Key.) Soon after, in 1413, a law was passed by Henry V, decreeing that all Lollards, or those who possessed or read Wicliff’s books, (especially his New Testament) should forfeit land, cattle, goods, body, life, and be condemned for heretics to God, enemies to the crown, and ardent traitors to the land. (Townley ; and also Le Bas’ Wicliff 241.)—Once more, at the Council of Constance in 1415 Gerson complained of “many *laymen* among the heretics having a version of the Bible in the vulgar tongue, to the great prejudice of the Catholic faith :” adding ; “It has been proposed to reprove this scandal in the Committee of Reform.” (Waddington p. 692)

extermination forthwith, and long after, urged as one of the most meritorious of religious duties. First, in the 3rd Lateran Council, A. D. 1179, anathema was declared against certain dissentients and heretics of cognate character; then against the Waldenses themselves, in papal Bulls of the years 1183, 1207, 1208. Again, in a decree of the 4th Lateran Council, held A. D. 1215, a *Crusade*, as it was called, was proclaimed against them; and “plenary absolution promised, to such as should perish in the holy war, of all sins committed from the day of their birth to that of their death.” “And never,” says Sismondi,¹ “had the cross been taken up with more unanimous consent;” and never, we may add, was the merciless spirit of murder exhibited more awfully in all its horrors.—It was accompanied and followed by the *Inquisition*: an institution assignable to Dominic, or rather Gregory IX,² as its *earthly* author, but evidently and originally the invention of *hell*: that horrid tribunal which carried on its inquest after heresy unseen, but with the power of the secular arm, the Princes of the West, supporting it,³ into all the individualities and privacies of domestic life.—The same spirit was manifested on the attempts at a revival of religion in England, from 1360 to 1380, by Wicliff,—and in Bohemia, some thirty or forty years after, by Huss and Jerome.⁴—Thus, during the latter half of the four centuries that we speak of, whether under the name of Petrobrussians, Catharists, Waldenses, Albigenses, Wicliffites, Lollards, Hussites, Bohemians, not dissentient heretics only, but disciples of Christ the most genuine, if dissentient, were marked out as sheep for the slaughter. Popes and Councils, priests and people, the secular powers and the spiritual, all united in the war-cry: and racks and gibbets, fire

¹ History of the Crusade, p. 25. The Waldenses, it must be remembered, were mixed up with the Albigenses as sufferers in it.

² See Mosheim's correction of Limborch, xiii. 2. 5. 4. Its foundation was laid in the Decree of Pope Lucius A. D. 1183. Dominic acted *individually* as an inquisitor against the Albigenses. But the *Court of the Inquisition*, (chiefly still of Dominican monks) was not regularly formed till 1233, after Dominic's death.

³ Especially, on its first institution, by Frederic II, and the French King Louis IX. Mosh. xiii. 2. 5. 6. ⁴ See the horrid account in Waddington, p. 601.

and sword, were deemed the fit weapons to use against them. *Murder* was one in the black catalogue of the sins, during this period, of Papal Christendom.

Such were the prominent characteristics of what was then called *religion* in Western Europe : and so did *idolatry* mark it, together with *sorceries*, *fornications*, *thefts*, *murders*, as its concomitants,—just as described in this brief but most significant predictive clause,—through the “hour, day, month, and year,” up to the fall of the Greek empire. The devotees to chivalry and romance, indeed, would paint these middle ages as the *ages of faith* :¹ and the lovers alike of mysticism and of ritualism as periods of the *illumination* and *perfection* of the Church.² But the religion contemplated by the majority

¹ I refer to the voluminous Work lately published under that title.

² See Görres' *Christliche Mystik*.—Referring to the pseudo-Dionysius' theory of three successive periods in the spiritual progress of the soul, the period of *purification*, of *illumination*, and of *perfection* or *consummation*, he observes that a similar progression may be traced in the history of Christendom. 1. The ages from the Goths to Charlemagne: in which fire and sword uprooted and burnt up the weeds from the European soil, so fitting it for the seeds of higher civilization. 2. From the latter part of the 11th to the beginning of the 13th century : a period distinguished by great reforms in the church, state, and school : the church being emancipated from secular power, reforming the monastic orders, and enforcing the old practice of the celibacy on the Clergy; the European nations advancing in order, liberty and civilization : and in the schools, universities being established, the Aristotelian philosophy adopted, and the dawn appearing of poetry and art. The best symbol, says Görres, and representative of this age of moral and intellectual regeneration, is St. Bernard. 3. From the beginning to the close of the 13th century; in which age there was an astonishing development of energy in church and state : each being a hierarchy of corporations of a mystical nature in themselves and in their mutual relations, the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre the one all-mastering idea of Christendom, and the influence of Christian mysticism manifested alike in architecture, painting, philosophy, and poetry. In no age had mysticism so thoroughly impregnated all the institutions of life and productions of genius.

Such are the views of Görres, as abstracted by a Romanist admirer in the *Dublin Review*, Jan. 1839. And truly, after reading it, and with the historical facts that we have considered before us, the sketch may well make us admire the pictorial power of German, or rather Roman, mysticism and romance!

Görres' method of confirming one of his points, by constituting St. Bernard the *representative* of the age he lived in is ingenious and concise. But we might as well characterize the philosophy and religion of England about the close of the 9th century by making Alfred its symbol.—With regard to the *middle* of the 12th century, Bernard's own picture of the then state of the church *generally* (e. g. Serm. xiii. 6, 7, in Cantic.) is a sufficient refutation of Görres: with regard to the *close* of the 13th that of the General Council of Vienne, held A. D. 1313. See Waddington, pp. 332—334, and 480.—Mr. Maitland, we have observed, (see p. 10 Note 3 *suprà*,) gives up the defence of the middle age after A. D. 1200.

of such describers, is obviously the *imaginative* and the *external*; not that which the Bible alone recognizes of heart-cleansing practical godliness. And the *generalizing inductive process* by which some, from a series of carefully selected extracts out of the voluminous scholastic and mystic writers, with more or less of moral beauty in them, and more or less of religious truth, would infer such a religion as the *spirit of the age*, carries its own refutation with it.¹ On this point appeal must be made to the *facts of history*. And these are as directly against them, as they accord in every iota with the wonderful predictive statement now before us.²

II. Nor, as the prophecy further intimated, did the terror of the fall of Constantinople induce either *reformation* or *repentance*. Of these not a sign is discoverable in the acts or history either of the ruling powers or body corporate of Western Christendom. Rather there is to be perceived, in respect of each sin here reprobated, fresh authorization and fresh addition.

Thus as regards the established *dæmonolatry*.—It was in 1460 that the Dominican *Alain de la Roche*, in hyperdulia of the *Virgin Mary*, revived in the christian world the use of the *Rosary* first invented by Dominic :

¹ What if we were to make a carefully chosen selection of extracts from the best Greek and Roman moralists of the Pagan schools, from Cicero down to Plutarch and M. Aurelius, and infer from them the moral excellence of the Greeks and Romans during the two centuries embraced by them? Such is the method pursued in the Ages of Faith.—On the general character of the doctrine of the *scholastic* doctors of the middle ages it will be worth the while for the investigator of truth to consult Brucker, or Enfield, Book vii. Of the *mystics*, while many were wild enthusiasts, it is readily allowed that there were some, perhaps not a few, sincere but secret worshippers of God. (See Waddington, p. 700.) Such the Apocalyptic prophecy expressly recognizes. See on Apoc. vii and xii.

² It may be useful to the reader at this point, to compare what is here said of the sins of Papal Christendom, with what is said afterwards of those of Babylon, and of the final reprobates; and to mark anticipatively their similitude. Apoc. xviii. 23; "The light of a candle shall no more shine in thee, . . . for by thy *sorceries* were all the nations deceived. And in her was found the *blood* of the prophets and saints, and of all that were slaughtered on the earth."—xxi. 8; "The unbelievers, and abominable, and *murderers*, and *whoremongers*, and *sorcerers*, and *idolaters*, and all *liars*, shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone."—xxii. 15; "Without are dogs, and *sorcerers*, and *whoremongers*, and *murderers*, and *idolaters*, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie."

—the mechanical devotion of which, with its 15 bead-told decads of Aves and Pater-Nosters intermingling, embraced alike by high and low, laics and ecclesiastics, became soon the rage in Christendom, and consecrated by Papal sanction still continues.¹ It was in 1476 that Pope Sixtus the IVth, in support of the same favorite branch of dæmonolatry, gave sanction to an annual festival in honour of the Virgin's *immaculate conception*; condemning and excommunicating its impugners:—a dogma this not only palpably false, absurd, and unscriptural, but which had hitherto, since first it was agitated, some 300 years before, by the Franciscans, been left even by Popes and Councils undetermined.²—Further the system of *canonization* was still continued, and, by mere Papal fiat, new *δαίμονα* added to the old. For example, in 1460 the enthusiast *Catharine of Sienna* was canonized by Pope Pius II;³ in 1482 *Bonaventura*, the blasphemer, by Sixtus IV;⁴ and in 1494, by Alexander VI, the more respectable name of Archbishop *Anselm*.⁵ Alexander's Bull, in language more heathen than christian, avows it to be *the Pope's duty* thus to

¹ See Southey Vindic. Eccl. Angl. 483, &c.—In Bellarmine's *Doctrina Christiana Breve*, a manual authorized by Papal approbation, these 15 mysteries are explained. In answer to the question, "Why repeat the Ave after the Lord's Prayer?" the answer is given, "That by the intercession of the Virgin Mary I may more easily obtain from God what I ask." But there are ten *Aves* to one *Pater-Noster*: and what of *Christ's* intercession?

² Harduin ix. 1495.—The controversy about the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary had originated about 1140 A. D.; and festivals, though not by authority, begun to be celebrated in its honor. Bernard strenuously opposed the dogma; justly considering that it invested her with an immunity which belonged to Christ alone. See Mosh. xv. 2. 4. 2; and xii. 2. 3. 19. ³ Wadd. p. 641.

⁴ In the Hereford Discussion between the Rev. J. Venn and the Rev. James Waterworth, it was admitted by the latter (an able and learned Romish priest) that Bonaventura's Psalter to the Virgin Mary, turning the addresses to God into addresses to the Virgin, was *blasphemy*. But 1st he impugned its genuineness. How vainly Mr. Venn has amply shown: for it appears in the *Pope's own authorized Edition* of Bonaventura's Works, published at Rome. 2ly, said Mr. W., this Edition was not published till 1588, above 100 years after his canonization; and the canonizing Pope might not know of the Psalter. But Rome, since its publication, has not only not disavowed its own saint, (this would indeed be to shake the whole Roman heaven with its saints into dissolution) but actually, notwithstanding Mr. W's denial of the fact, still publicly uses the Psalter; as will appear by a notice in my third volume under the fifth Vial.—Would not Mr. W. have done more wisely in adopting the casuist Veron's canon about *relics*; (see p. 15 Note 3;) and saying that it is not an *article of faith* to believe the saints invoked to be really those that the names indicate?

⁵ Harduin ix. 1552.—See other examples in Butler.

choose out, and to hold up the illustrious dead, as their merits claim, for adoration and worship.¹

Again, with the increasing dæmonolatry, both *sorceries* and *thefts* increased also. Rosaries were for *sale*; and blasphemous visions and lying miracles were, with the most solemn asseverations, urged by Alain and his fraternity in promotion of the sale.² *Indulgences* invited the devout to the celebration of the *immaculate conception*; the rites of which were to bring *gains*, as usual, to the priests that celebrated them, and rob the poor worshipper. Each act of *canonization* was a recognition of the new saint's miracle-working, whereby to draw devotees and offerings to the local shrine. Nor did Rome accord the canonization without first itself receiving payment.³ In similar consideration for himself and his capital, Paul II, (Pope from 1464 to 1471,) reduced the *jubilee* cycle for pilgrimages to Rome to a period of twenty-five years; thereby accelerating the return of that absurd but most lucrative ceremony.⁴ For those who could not go on pilgrimages to the saints' shrines, *relics* were *farmed*, and *indulgences* also, all through this half century; and the country overrun by the hawkers that farmed them.⁵ With the latter, as the 16th century opened, the name of *Tetzel* is infamously associated; (of whom more a little later :) and, connected as this was with the legends invented and preached to promote the

¹ Ib. "Romanus Pontifex viros claros, et qui in præsentî vitâ dum fuerunt vitæ sanctimoniâ floruerunt, et eorum exigentibus clarissimis meritis aliorum sanctorum numero aggregari merentur,—inter sanctos prædictos debet collocare, et ut sanctos ab omnibus Christi fidelibus coli, venerari, et adorari mandare."

² Southey Vind. 484, &c, The Jesuit *Echard* confesses to his incredulity of Alain's visions; somewhat as Gerson, at the Council of Constance, in respect of the miracles and legends then current. L'Enfant i. 470, 609.

³ See the Ordo Canonizationis in Harduin ix. 1548; a curious document, sent to Canterbury apparently from Rome, on occasion of the petition for Anselm's canonization. Notice occurs in the Ordo of the Arms of him "*cujus expensis fit canonizatio*" being suspended, among other decorations, in the canopied erection for the Pope. Harduin observes that a *statement of the expences* preceded the Ordo in his MSS. But this, he says, "quæd ad rem non faciant," he omits!

One is reminded by it of what Battista Mantuano says of Rome, in his Poem De Calamitatibus Temporum,—a poem written about the time referred to;

..... venalia nobis
Templa, sacerdotes, altaria, sacra, coronæ,
Ignis, thura, preces; cælum est venale, Dcusque.

Roscoe's Leo X. (3rd Ed.) Vol. i. p. 98.

⁴ Mosheim xv. 2. 2. 17.

⁵ Merle D'Aubigne's Luther, p. 25.

sale, it may be considered as the crowning example of the union of *thefts* and *sorceries* in the Papal system.¹

Meanwhile *impurity* had advanced also ; chiefly among the priesthood. The Popes led the way. So *Innocent VIII*, elected in 1484 to be the *Holy Father* of Christendom ; whose character is told in the well-known *allusive* epigram.² So *Alexander VI*, his successor : who at the close of the 15th century stood before the world a monster, notorious to all, of impurity, as of every other vice.³ Rome throughout copied his example. "Most of the ecclesiastics," says the historian *Infessura*, "had their mistresses ; and all the convents of the capital were houses of ill fame." And as at Rome, so in the provinces. In many places the priests paid the bishop a tax for the woman with whom he lived, and for every child he had by her : (so established and unblushing was the custom, now of above six centuries' duration :) and *Erasmus* tells of a German bishop publicly declaring, at a grand entertainment, that 11,000 priests had come to him for that purpose.⁴—Could the *confessional* but add to the mischief ?⁵ The leprosy affected Christendom.

¹ As to *indulgences*, an idea of the immense sale of them at the opening of the 16th century, may be formed by a boast in 1507 of the famous, or rather infamous *Tetzel*, that in two days he had got 2000 florins by their sale in the town of *Fribourg*. So, as *Luther* expressed it afterwards, did the Pope "*poll and rob Christ's people.*" (*Foxe*, v. 685, 688.) "They repented not of their *robberies* ;" κλεμματα. But in alluding to *Luther's* time I a little anticipate.

² "Octo nocens pueros genuit, totidemque puellas :

Hunc merito poterit dicere Roma patrem."—*Merle* iii. 359.

³ His original name was *Rodrigo Borgia*. See *Merle D'Aubigné's* sketch of his character, i. 40. He lived first with a Roman lady, then, while a cardinal and archbishop, with her daughter *Vanozza*. He obtained the popedom A.D. 1492, by bribing each of the cardinals at a stipulated price. He then celebrated the marriage of his daughter *Lucretia*, another of his mistresses being present at it, and the festivities enlivened by farces and indecent songs.—The dissolute entertainments given by him, his equally infamous son *Cæsar*, and daughter *Lucretia*, are such as may not be described or thought of. He died in 1503. According to general report it was by poison prepared by himself for a rich cardinal. But *Roscoe*, in his *Life of Leo X.*, shows that *this* report is doubtful.

⁴ "Uno anno ad se delata undecim millia sacerdotum palam concubinariorum." *Erasmii Op.* Tom. ix. p. 401 ; quoted by *Merle*, ubi supra, from whom also I have borrowed the extract from *Infessura*. In the 11th Session of the 5th Lateran Council this custom is noted and reprobated. "Quia vero in quibusdam regionibus nonnulli jurisdictionem ecclesiasticam habentes pecuniarios quæstus à concubinariis percipere non erubescunt, &c."—See in Note 4 p. 442, Vol. I, and Note 2 p. 14 supra, earlier notices of this infamous practice. Indeed the Council of *Sens*, the latest referred to at p. 14 belongs to the half century now under review.

⁵ Compare *Pius IV's* Constitution, A. D. 1560, "contra sacerdotes in confessionibus sacramentalibus penitentes ad turpia sollicitantes."

Finally there was a notable persistence in the *murders* of Christ's saints. Of *insulated* cases I will notice only that of the Dominican Savonarola; an enthusiast, but one of the wisest and worthiest of the age;¹ who, on preaching at Florence against the vices of Rome, and predicting, what his soul longed for, an approaching theocracy under the Lord Jesus, in place of the then corrupt government, was in 1498 seized by the Papal emissaries, and burnt at the stake.—More early in the half century, and on a scale of magnitude such as to force the world's attention to them, *anti-heretical crusades* had been proclaimed and carried on. The *Bohemians* and *Waldenses* were the victims. Against the *former*, Paul the 2nd urged the crusade. Elected Pope himself in the year 1464, because as a Venetian he seemed the fittest of the Cardinals to direct the energies of Christendom against its dreaded foe the Turks, he actually diverted the Hungarian King from warring against *them* to warring against these Bohemian Hussites; and promised him the crown of Bohemia as his guerdon. Fiercely, but in this case vainly, the war raged seven years. Then the old policy was resorted to, to conquer by dividing. The *Calixtines*, the less decided and spiritual of the dissentients, were incited against the *Tabornites*, the more spiritual: which latter had already, indeed, since the year 1457 formed a distinct church, under the name of the *United Brethren*. And the civil persecution thus arising proved to this little remnant more bitter and more murderous, than all they had suffered in common with the rest from external war.²

In the war against the *Waldenses* of Piedmont, in the years 1477 and 1488, by Popes Sextus IV and Innocent VIII, the same spirit presided. Having commented on the heresies of the Vaudois, Pope Innocent commanded all archbishops, bishops, and vicars to obey his inquisitor, and engage the people to take up arms, with a view

¹ Mosh. xv. 2, 2, 24.—See on this interesting character Dean Waddington's account, taken mainly from Sismondi and Roscoe, p. 714, &c.

² Bost's *Freres Moraves*, Tom. i. Liv. iii. p. 62, &c. (2nd Ed. Paris.)

to so holy and necessary an extermination; granting indulgences to all that would make the crusade against them, and authority to apply to their own use whatever property they might seize. It was then that 18,000 regular troops burst upon the vallies. And had not a feeling of compunction visited the sovereign, Philip of Savoy, the work of destruction would probably have been complete.¹—Then too was accomplished the actual extirpation of the Christians of Val Louise in the High Dauphiny. “Having retired,” says the historian, “into the caverns of the highest mountains, the French king’s lieutenant commanded a great quantity of wood to be laid at the entrance of those caverns, to burn or smoke them out. And some were slain in attempting to escape. Some threw themselves headlong on the rocks below: some were smothered. There were afterwards found within the caverns 400 infants stifled in the arms of their dead mothers. It is believed that 3000 persons perished in all on that occasion in the valley.”²—May not the blood well curdle at a recital of such atrocities?

Once more, it was in 1478 that that *reform*, as it was called, of the *Inquisition* took place, the Pope and King of Spain combining in the arrangement, whereby it was rendered an instrument of persecution and murder far more perfect than before. In the first year alone 2000 were burnt as victims. These furnished to it its prelibation of blood. Each year others followed. It is Llorente’s computation from official documents, that from this its reorganization to the commencement of the Reformation in 1517, there were 13,000 persons burnt by it for heresy, besides 8700 burnt in effigy, and 169,000 condemned to penances.³ What it was prepared to do, with the torture and the stake, on the outbreak of the Reformation, who knows not?

¹ Acland, p. 12, 13.

² Perrin ii. ch. 3: given by Gilly in his *Life of Neff*, p. 90.—How suitable Milton’s beautiful Sonnet, composed after a similar tragedy in 1655:

“Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold: &c.”

³ M’Crie’s *Reformation in Spain*, p. 86—89.

Thus have we historic proof in respect of the *latter half of the 15th century*, following the fall of Constantinople, as well as in respect of the *four centuries* that preceded it, of the fulfilment of every particular in the prophetic statement before us. “The rest of the men, who were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship *dæmons*, and *idols* of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood : neither repented they of their *sorceries*, nor of their *fornications*, nor of their *thefts*, nor of their *murders*.”

And so the 15th century closed in. Wretched,—I may say *hopelessly* wretched,—seemed the state of the Church at that epoch ; hopeless to the reflective and philanthropic statesman or ecclesiastic ; hopeless almost to the real Christian. And more especially for this reason : because it was not the mere fact of the present existence of moral and religious corruption that met the eye in the gloomy prospect,—grievous though this was, and such as to force confession from every quarter :¹ but the fearful superadded fact, also, that remedies such as human wisdom could suggest, had, during the long period of the accumulation of these corruptions, been one after another tried, and failed ; yea, and the Christian might think within himself, the efforts also of really christian reformists, his brethren before him. Indeed the fact of the *trial and failure of these remedies* seems to me so important to the right appreciation of the hopelessness of things at the epoch before the Reformation,

¹ “Nulla in moribus disciplina ; nulla in sacris literis eruditio ; nulla in rebus divinis reverentia ; nulla propemodum jam erat religio.” Such is Bellarmine’s judgment of the epoch. Tom. vi. col. 296. (Colon. 1617.)

Much the same statement of the corruptions of the times is to be found in most of the Orations before the fifth Lateran Council.

Let me add the following from a cotemporary Roman poet of some eminence :

quo tempore mores
Præcipites labi cæpere, et recta relinqui
Officia, et metis longè post terga relictis
Roma potens sceleri totas effudit habenas.

Sylva Philomusi Novocomensis, in the Appendix to Roscoe’s Leo X ; No. LXIX.

that I cannot feel it right to conclude this historical chapter without a brief notice of them. I speak particularly of those remedies which, before the face of Christendom, human policy had suggested and tried for the amelioration of the corruptions of the Church ; in so far as they affected, that which alone human policy concerns itself with, the well-being of the social system.

It is to be remembered then that at the commencement of the four and a half centuries we have been reviewing, the prestige had already begun to pass away from the minds of the more intelligent, under which Charlemagne and his successors in the kingdoms of the West, had considered it their policy to accord political power, and privileges almost indefinitely great, alike to the priesthood and hierarchy of their respective states, and to the Bishops of Rome ; as if the best and only means of softening and civilizing the minds of the semi-barbarous population under their sway.¹ Proud, ambitious, idle, covetous, it had come to be understood that the great object with both the priesthood in general, and with the hierarchy heading them, was not the religious improvement of the community, but their own aggrandizement. Moreover the morals of these ecclesiastics were seen to be as corrupt, for the most part, or even more so, than of those whom they should have reformed. And thus the cry had now risen up against them, and it waxed louder and louder through the 12th century, as constituting almost the chief *cause*, instead of the chief *cure*, of the prevalent immorality and irreligion.²

¹ Mosheim viii. 2. 2. 4, quotes as follows from William of Malmesbury's Work *De Rebus Angliæ*, Lib. v. "Carolus Magnus, pro contundendâ gentium illarum ferociâ, omnes pæne terras ecclesiis contulerat : conciliosissimè perpensens nolle sacri ordinis homines tam faciliè quàm laicos fidelitatem Domini rejicere : prætereâ, si laici rebellarent, illos posse excommunicationis auctoritate, et potentie severitate, comescere."—Milner observes, on the 13th century : "It has been said that a power such as of the Pope was necessary at that time to tame the ferocious spirit of men, and preserve some order in society. It may be allowed that it was a cement, but it was the cement of iniquity." This is strong language, but I believe it is the only true, and only philosophical view of the subject.

² "A legend of that age," says Mr. Southey, speaking of the middle of the 12th century, "marks the opinion which was entertained of the general depravity of the clergy. It was related in history," (that is by William of Malmesbury,) "and not as a fable but a fact, that Satan and the company of infernal spirits sent

It was when this impression was rife and strong, (being early in the 13th century,) and when the ecclesiastical power, and even Papacy itself, might seem to have been jeopardied by it, that there arose the two *mendicant* orders of monks, the *Dominicans* and *Franciscans*; acknowledging, as if to meet the emergency of the case, the general corruption of the clergy, asserting that their wealth had caused their corruption, and issuing forth from Rome themselves *bound by a vow of poverty*, as the heaven-sent reformers of Christendom. The revival of *preaching* by them, a portion of the ministerial office almost abandoned at this time by the established clergy, was well suited to increase the hope and expectation of good from their mission. It was possible, men thought, that what the Franciscans declared might be true; and that they were the fulfilment of the prefigurative vision of the Apocalyptic angel, that flew abroad having the everlasting Gospel to preach to every nation under heaven.¹ For near two centuries did the popular enthusiasm, in every country of the West, set in towards these mendicant Friars, as well as the Papal favor. The parochial clergy complained in vain of the neglect now continually shown to *their* order, and the desertion of their ministrations. The confidence of the public rested on the mendicant Friars, as alone exhibiting to the world an image of primitive simplicity and self-denial, alone acting out more-over the part of evangelists, and consequently as alone the true ministers of Jesus Christ.²—At length however

their thanks in writing, by a lost soul from hell, to the whole ecclesiastical body, for denying themselves no one gratification, and for sending more of their flock thither through their negligence, than had ever arrived in any former time."

Let the reader, in passing, compare this statement with Mr. Maitland's view of the 12th century.

¹ Wadd. 507.

² Le Bas, Wicliff, p. 105: "For a considerable time the new institution did its office to admiration. The effect was like the transfusion of fresh life-blood into a decaying system. The veins and arteries of the monster seemed to swell with renovated life, &c."—So too in earlier times Conrad, Abbot of Wisperg, in narrating the institution of these two orders of mendicants, prefaces the narration with a statement of the youth of the Church being renewed like the eagle's. "Eo tempore, mundo jam senescente, exortæ sunt duæ religiones in ecclesiâ; cujus, ut aquilæ, renovatur juvenus." The passage is given by Mr. Maitland, in his Book on the Waldenses, p. 398. Conrad speaks of the mendicant Friars as

it was seen, and Wicliff most of all men helped forward the conviction, that covetousness might lurk even under the guise of poverty,¹ ambition under that of humility. The lying fables and ridiculous superstitions, that formed the subject matter of their preaching, were unmasked; their intellectual emptiness and frivolity, their hatred of learning, their quarrelsomeness, proselytism of the ignorant youth,² and, against those whom they deemed heretics, their bigot cruelty. The result of their influence and preaching was seen to be anything rather than the reformation of the community. In England the reaction was such that their very name became offensive, and warrants were issued for their arrest.³—But to rid themselves of this more recent evil proved to be as difficult as deliverance from the old.⁴ The Pope, the supreme Head of Christendom, was found to be their patron; as indeed of almost all the corruptions under which it laboured. And against *the Pope* who could contend?

Then were the eyes of all that wished for an amelioration of things directed to a *General Council* as the panacæa;⁵ a Council not such as former ones, mere mouth-pieces of the Popes, but free and independent. The cry for it waxed louder and louder during the celebrated 40 or rather 50 years' schism, from 1377 to 1429: when rival Popes were anathematizing each other from Rome, from Avignon, or from Sicily; and the scandal

raised up specially in opposition to the Waldenses and Poor Men of Lyons.—An interesting account of them is given of them by Southey, in his *Book of the Church*, p. 196. See also Mosheim xiii. 2. 2. 21.

¹ See *Matthew of Paris'* invective against their accumulation of wealth and splendid buildings, referred to by Le Bas in his *Life of Wicliff*: also that of *Grotesteste*, who on their first establishment at Oxford, A. D. 1221, had originally patronized them; that of *Fitzralph*; and that of *Wicliff* himself. *Ibid.* p. 66, 106—108, &c.

² *Fitzralph*, in a sermon preached when he was Archbishop of Armagh, states that on this account, and from the parents' fears of their sons being inveigled by the mendicant friars, the number of students in Oxford had diminished from 30,000 to 6000. *Le Bas*, p. 111.

³ The warrants out against them were entitled, "De religiosis vagabondis arretandis per totum regnum." *Ib.* p. 110, from *Turner's England*, ii. 413.

⁴ e. g. in the case of *Grotesteste's* controversy with them, and the appeal to Rome.

⁵ So in *Cramp's Text Book of Popery*. Though "experience was little in their favor," yet "men regarded a Council as their dernier resort, the panacæa for all their woes, the forlorn hope of the church." p. 5.

of such a disunion in the visible Church was palpable and offensive. So the memorable Council of *Constance* was assembled A. D. 1414: and, with a view to the necessary power for remedying the evils in the church and Christendom, the great principle was asserted, that Popes themselves were inferior in authority, and subject to, a General Council. But as to any real moral or religious reformation from it, the expectations so highly, so universally raised ended, like those before, in disappointment.¹ In the matter of Huss and Jerome, (to which I have had occasion already to allude,) the Council exhibited itself as the ready copartner with Popes and clergy, in acts of falsehood, treachery, and oppression the most infamous. The reformation of the Church attempted by it proved to be insufficient, and only external. And even in respect of this, the new Pope, almost as soon as elected, found means of thwarting its intentions, and showing its impotency. Yet more in the subsequent General Councils of Ferrara and Florence, held about the middle of the 15th century, the very principle of the subordination of Popes to Councils, from which so much had been hoped, was formally renounced. The Council of Basle indeed reasserted it, but was at last worsted in the struggle by the Popes. Æneas Sylvius, its most celebrated advocate, having been made Pope, issued his own solemn Bull in retraction of it.² The secular powers, wearied with the ineffectual struggle, showed themselves less and less careful for the most part to reassert it. As the 15th century drew towards a close, the old clerical dogma had manifestly risen into re-ascendancy, that the Pope, as in God's place on earth, could not err, and by earthly powers might not be controlled.

There remained yet one remedy, and from which the more intellectual spirits of the 15th century hoped highly;—I mean the *light of literature*, which had now at length

¹ See Wadd. 548 &c, and Mosh. xv. 2. 2. 10, on the insufficiency of Councils.

² Harduin ix. 1449. His Papal title was Pius II.—The dates of the Councils referred to were as follows; of Basle from 1431 to 1443; of Ferrara from 1438 to 1439; of Florence from 1439 to 1442.

broken on the long intellectual night preceding; and which the cotemporaneous invention of printing, and flight of the Greek literati, with their literary treasures into the kingdoms of Western Europe, had combined, as was before said, to accelerate. Nor indeed was its effect on the established religion and the church small or unimportant. From *Dante* in its earliest and dim twilight, to *Erasmus*, two centuries after, at the day-dawn, the effect was more and more to expose, in the light of common sense and intellectual truth, alike the corrupt morals of the clergy, and the absurdity and falsehood of much of the long received system of superstition. And it was not merely the laity that felt the influence. By the higher and more educated of the ecclesiastics it was felt also; especially in Italy, that cradle of the new-born classic literature of Europe. But in what spirit? And to what practical result? Was it so as to induce a purer faith, and an abandonment of the superstitions and corruptions thus exposed to view? Far from it. The faith of the gospel of Jesus classic literature professed not to teach, nor indeed itself knew. This lay hid in the *Bible*; a book still little known, and where known by the mere classic enthusiast, despised.¹ Literature without the *Bible* could make infidels; it could not make Christians. And thus it did with them. As to the superstitions established, false as they were now felt to be, the selfish interests involved in their retention with the clergy, and with the laity the penalties of heresy, forbade their abandonment. Nor did the new philosophy make objection. It professed not the martyr's spirit;² nor had it any more the wish than the power to arouse the conscience, or turn the heart to repentance. Thus the superstitions of the Romish apostacy were in outward rite and form persisted in as before; while the current conversational language, and even the writings of high ecclesiastics evidenced their unbelief in them; and the fashion arose

¹ Cardinal Bembo, finding Sadoletto occupied in translating the Epistle to the Romans, said, "Leave such childish things. They become not a man of sense." Merle i. 58.—Compare Leo Juda's observations on Apoc. x. 1, in corroboration.

² So Erasmus. See his letter to Cardinal Campeggio; Milner, p. 879.

to give them, as much as possible, a classic and a heathen turn.¹ Instead of reforming the church, the effect on the great mass of the priesthood, ministering in it, of this boasted march of literature and intellect, was only to add to their other corruptions a more unblushing profaneness and hypocrisy.—Above all, this was the case at Rome. The character that has been given of the last Pope of the 15th century, was in a measure applicable also to the literary cardinals and hierarchy of Rome gathered round him. It was an *atheist* priesthood;² and its hypocrisy deliberate, systematic, avowed, and unblushing, before the face of God and man.³

Such was the approved futility and failure of each human scheme and effort at amelioration of the corruptions of the church;—amelioration of them, I mean, in so far as they shocked the public mind, and palpably affected the public weal. As the 16th century opened, there were still many proficients in literature, indeed, that looked for a change, though a change they knew not what, as the result of the literary and intellectual development in progress. Nor had the hopes from an independent Council been altogether abandoned. In fact a Council with this pretension had gathered just at this time at Pisa; disavowed by the Pope and the rest of Christendom, but with a few cardinals and the French king supporting it. Its feebleness was however

¹ “Le Cardinal Bembo au lieu de St. Esprit écrivoit, *Le souffle du Zephyr Celeste*; au lieu de remettre les péchés, *flechir les manes et les dieux souverains*; au lieu de Christ fils de Dieu, *Minerve sortie du front de Jupiter.*” Merle i. 58.—So also Michelet, *Memoires de Luther*, i. 17: “S’ils nommaient le Pape c’etait le *grand Pontife*; un saint canonizé était, dans leur langage, *relatus inter Divos*; et s’ils parlaient de la grace, ils disaient, *Deorum immortalium beneficiis.*” (Ed. Bruxelles 1837).

² “Il y avait à cette époque une perversité raisonnée et scientifique, une magnifique ostentation de sceleratesse; disons tout d’un mot, le prêtre athée, se croyant roi du monde.” Michelet, i. 13.

³ It is related by Luther, that on his visit to Rome, in 1510, and when dining with some of its prelates, they related jokingly how, when saying mass at the altar, instead of the sacramental words which were to transform the elements into the body and blood of Christ (according to the doctrine of transubstantiation) they pronounced over them, “Bread thou art, and bread thou shalt remain! Wine thou art, and wine thou shalt remain!” “And then,” they continued, “we elevate the pyx, and all the people worship.” Merle i. 192. The anecdote is most characteristic.

manifest. The hopes that centered round it were but the shadows of what, a century before, had attended and watched around the gathering at Constance.—On the whole, the evils of the church seemed to be beyond the reach of human remedial policy or power. And with many of the more reflective, doubtless, the suspicion had arisen that the disease must needs be deeper seated, as well as the remedy more powerful and searching, than any yet suggested.—In effect such was the very case. It was apostacy from their God and Saviour that constituted the essence of the disease that had so long afflicted Christendom. And remedy there could be none but the republication of his own gospel of grace, and with the power of his own Spirit accompanying it.

Nor let it be forgotten, finally, though this is not the place to dwell on it, that some there had been, and were, that understood this truth of the case, both as regarded the disease and the remedy; some the off-scouring perhaps of men, but the beloved of God:—the same that had been prefigured in vision as the mystic 144,000, “called, and chosen, and faithful,” which would as a body remain indestructible before Him: ¹ most of them being indeed only God’s *secret ones*; but some, bolder and more discerning, his *witnesses*, in an apostate world.—Of these last many and earnest had been the efforts (as I have already just hinted, and must in my chapter on the Witnesses notice yet again) to make the gospel of the grace of the Lord Jesus known among men. And many too and earnest had been their prayers; and high doubtless at times their hopes, through these dark ages, that He, whom to know was light and life, would at length signally interfere for his own cause and church.²—But time went on, and He appeared not; the first watch of the night,—the second watch,—the third watch. Their strength was spent. Their hopes waxed fainter. Persecuted, proscribed, wasted, scattered, their enemies seemed to have all but prevailed against them; and not

¹ See Vol. i. pp. 237, 238, &c.

² Compare Foxe ii. 778.

against them only, but against the cause that was dearer than themselves, the cause of truth, the cause of Jesus. When the Bohemian remnant sent into each part of Christendom, to see if there were any beside themselves to testify for Jesus, they found none.¹ It seemed almost as if He had forgotten them, and the promise had become a dead letter, that the gates of Hell should not prevail against them.—But could it be so? Oh no! Just at this crisis of extremity, the truth of the promise was to be made signally manifest. The very next vision in the Apocalyptic drama,—that of the descent of the covenant-Angel, and of the raising and ascension of his two witnesses from their apparent state of death, (for the vision is plainly continuous up to this latter figuration, and the whole included under the latter half of the sixth Trumpet,²)—I say the very next Apocalyptic vision represented to St. John that same glorious intervention of the Lord Jesus, which had been so long looked and prayed for. The next scene in the drama of European history is that of the REFORMATION.

CHAPTER II.

INTERVENTION OF THE COVENANT-ANGEL FULFILLED IN THE REFORMATION.

·APOC. X. 1—4.

“ And I saw (another³) mighty angel coming down from heaven, clothed with a cloud: and the rainbow was upon his head; and his face was as the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire; and he had in his hand a little book opened. And he set his right foot upon the sea,

¹ Comenius Hist. Eccl. Bohem. apud Fleming's Apocalyptic Key, p. 41, 42. Also Bost's Histoire des Freres Moraves, i. p. 87. This was A. D. 1489.

² It is at verse 18 of ch. ix. that the slaying of the third of men by the Turkish or 6th Trumpet woe is mentioned. It is not till ch. xi. 14, immediately after the ascension of the witnesses, and fall of the tenth part of the city, that the same 6th Trumpet woe is said to have ended.

³ αλλοθ. This word is omitted in many copies.

and his left upon the land ; and cried with a loud voice as a lion roareth." Apoc. x. 1—4.

Oh what a glorious vision to rejoice the heart of the Evangelist ! What a contrast to all that had been figured to his view since first the seven Trumpet-angels prepared themselves to sound ! Indeed we may say, with what a superiority of glory in it, to that of any figuration of the future fortunes of the Church, from the commencement of the Revelation until now ; and, as it proved, with nothing comparable to it afterwards, until the vision that foreshowed the glories of the consummation.

I said, what a vision to rejoice the heart of the Evangelist ! And first, was there not comfort for him in the very *character* and *person* of the angel intervening ? For whom might he suppose this angel ? The vision represented him as a *mighty* angel, that had a *rainbow*, or rather *the rainbow*,—the rainbow of the covenant,¹—circling his head : whose form moreover appeared mantled with a *cloud* ; yet not so mantled as to hide from the Evangelist, as he descended, the sight of his *face as the sun*, and of *his feet as pillars of fire*. From all which it was evident that it was the LORD JESUS, the mighty One of Israel,—mighty whether to save or to destroy,—the Angel of the covenant :—Him whose presence, mantled with a cloud as his proper covering, (I say *proper*, because of no created angel was the glory such as to need its shrouding,²) was under the older dis-

¹ Bishop Middleton observes on the word ; “ The authorities which direct us to read *ἡ ἰρις* are very numerous ; and the best modern editors have admitted the article into the text :” intimating, however, that he can see no reasons for it. “ The names of the great objects of nature,” he says, “ the sun, the moon, the air, &c. usually have the article ; but these are permanent and monadic. The word *ἰρις* seems to have no other claim to it than have *σεισμος*, *εκλειψις*, &c. and the names of other transient phenomena.”—The difficulty is solved by regarding it as the iris of the covenant. It is thus both monadic, and also prementioned. See Apoc. iv. 3.—This is the first of three notices by the Bishop on the presence, unaccountably to him, of the Greek article, that I shall have in this chapter and the next to refer to ; as being both explained by the predictive meaning of the vision, and itself reflecting important light on that meaning.

² There is, I believe, no single instance of a created angel appearing vested in a cloud. It was the ensign of Deity. So ; “ He maketh the clouds his cha-

penetration seen to visit this our earth, first by Israel in the wilderness, then by one and another of the prophets afterwards; and whose countenance as the sun, and his feet like fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace, St. John had himself beheld at the opening of the Apocalyptic visions, when, overcome by the greatness of the glory, he fell at his feet as dead.¹ Had other evidence been wanting, it was given afterwards in his speaking of the two witnesses for christian truth as *his* witnesses.² So that the fact was indubious. And was it not joyous for him to see the Lord he loved, appearing on the dark theatre, just depicted, of this world; and showing that He had neither forgotten nor forsaken his church?

Further, the *nature* and *object of the intervention* indicated must have been most cheering to him. For what the object evidently, but the vindication of his own honour, and revelation of his own grace and gospel? To this tended each epithet and characteristic noted of the Angel and his descent in the vision:—indications never to be overlooked. For in the Apocalyptic notices of the intervention of the Lord Jehovah, just as in those of other scriptures,³ we find that those among his attributes are for the most part chosen for specification or exhibition, which best suit the nature of the action on which He is about to enter, and which are in it to be most displayed and glorified. For example, in the vision of the 7th chapter, long since analyzed, the action represented being that of his electing, quickening, enlightening, and sealing his own true disciples, from amidst the multitude of vain professors, each epithet and descriptive trait there noted of the covenant-angel was shown to have a bearing on the work he was then engaged in.⁴ Nor, as I conceive, to the Evangelist's own

riot;”—“His pavilion, round about him, was dark waters and thick clouds of the skies.” Psalm civ. 3, xviii. 2; 2 Sam. xxii. 12, &c.

¹ Apoc. i. 15. Compare Dan. x. 6.

² Apoc. xi. 3.

³ So in the example of the Lord's descent to ransom Israel out of Egypt, alluded to in the text below; again in that of his appearing with the drawn sword, as the Captain of the Lord's host, to Joshua, Josh. v. 13; and that of his appearance to Ezekiel in the chariot of the fiery cherubim, when about to destroy Jerusalem: &c.

⁴ “An angel from the East, having the seal of the life-giving God.” See Vol. I. p. 243.

perception was there wanting in the revelation the accompaniment of light on the scene, like as of the day-spring from the East. But there was not then the figuring, so as here, of any bright irradiation before St. John of the covenant-rainbow's light, and the sunbeams of his glory; nor again of any such descending in power, and planting of his feet on land and sea, and speaking in voice audible over the earth; but only of speaking to the angelic ministries employed in his providential government. In so far as regarded the perceptions of the inhabitants of this world, the sealing revelation was figured as a work noiseless and unimpressive.—What then of an intervention prefigured as *this* was, with all these circumstantialia of glory and power accompanying? It was surely to be inferred from them that it would be one sudden, striking, and most extraordinary, in vindication of his *covenant of mercy* to the Church;—somewhat perhaps as when in similar guise of the pillar of fire and of the cloud, he descended to deliver Israel from out of Egypt:—that it would be one in which He would specially display before men his illuminating beams as the *Sun of righteousness*; and in which by word, and perhaps by act, (not without some exercise of his mighty power accompanying it,) he would *assert his rights* to this world as his inheritance, and with voice audible through the whole Roman world, even as of the *Lion* of the tribe of Judah, would rebuke and strike terror into the enemies of his Church. By the *book* that He held opened in his hand, the instrumental means seemed figured whereby all this was to be accomplished; viz. the opening of the volume of his own book, the *Bible*. And as, in the deliverance of Israel from out of Egypt, the pillar of fire did not only give light to Israel, but sent out its lightning-fires, as the Psalmist intimates, to trouble the host of the Egyptians,¹ so the notice of his feet now appearing as pillars of fire from beneath the cloud that mantled Him,

¹ Psalm lxxvii. 17, 18, compared with Exod. xiv. 24. Compare also Obadiah 18; "And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Esau for stubble;" &c.

might be meant to signify that He would make the destroying fire of his power to be felt among men, to the confusion of his enemies, and the triumph of his own cause and people. Or rather the intended reference of this particular emblem might be to that description given by Himself of the effects of his first promulgation of the Gospel, "I am come to send fire on the earth:"¹ and the intimation be that now, as then, through man's enmity to the truth, the effect of its republication would be divisions, contentions, and wars of opinion, fierce even as a kindled conflagration.

Thus much, I say, might, as it seems to me, have been inferred by the Evangelist from the circumstantial of the vision, concerning the nature, glory, and results of the intervention from heaven here prefigured. And can we to whom it has been allotted to live in this latter age, and have thus been enabled to trace in the succeeding mutations and events of the world the fulfilment of so much of the apocalyptic prophecy,—can we, after having been brought in our investigation of its series of prefigurative visions, step by step through the Roman world's history, down to the close of the 15th century, hesitate to recognize in that before us, (it being the next that followed,) the figuring of that grand event with which the 16th opened,—the REFORMATION? Surely, if we look simply to the one most prominently marked characteristic of the figuration, as betokening some extraordinary, sudden, light-giving, world-arousing intervention of the Lord Jesus for his own cause and church, there is not an event, from St. John's time even to the present, that can be shown to answer to it, but the Reformation; while, on the other hand, as it seems to me, not only does the Reformation answer to the figure in this respect, but there is not a particular in the vision of *all* we have just noted, in respect of which it did not answer, even to exactness. Sudden, unexpected, most extraordinary,—the human instrumentality employed so inadequate,

¹ Luke xii. 49. Compare too Jer. xxiii. 29; "Is not my word like fire?"

and the results of such surpassing importance,—if ever event had the character stamped upon it, above others, of some *direct intervention of divine providence*, this was the one. Its most prominent characteristic as a religious revival, consisted in its being one in which the glory of the Lord Jesus as the *Light of the soul*, the *Sun of Righteousness*, *Jehovah our Justification*, was publicly set forth, and by multitudes in different nations owned and felt. It was one in which, through the voice of the Reformers, far-sounding and loud, he rebuked his usurping enemies, even as *the Lion of the tribe of Judah*; and, both by it, and by the providential overthrow of the usurper's power in a *tenth of the apostate city*,¹ did also assert his rights to this earth as his inheritance:—all in connexion with the *opening of his own written word*, that had been so long neglected and forgotten; the *re-publication*, if I may so say, of his *gospel*.² Finally, the auspicious result of this deliverance of his church and his religion was not accomplished without *fiery contentions*; in the which the divine power was manifested, to discomfit the enemies of the truth. Just as it was said by Luther, when alluding long afterwards to the effect of his protestation against indulgences; “This was to set the world on fire, and disturb the whole order of the universe.”³

In truth all this seems to me so evident, even from the mere general view of the Reformation, to which in the present chapter I wish to confine myself, that I cannot but admire that any protestant interpreters,—those I mean more especially who explain the sixth Trumpet,

¹ See on xi. 13.—In Lev. xxvii. 30 we read, “All the title of the land is the Lord's.” It was the quit-rent, if I may so say, in acknowledgment of his title to the whole. And thus, perhaps, when a *tenth* was taken by him of the city, the very proportion may have been meant to indicate that it was an act asserting his right to all.

² So Dr. Haweis of the Reformation, in the Continuation to Milner's Church History:—“After ages of gloomy superstition and the reign of ignorance and primeval night, we have seen the Sun of righteousness rising with healing in his wings, to dispel the darkness:” adding also; “But however blessed the issue, the effects of the struggle between truth and error were greatly to be deplored; having produced wars which desolated the face of many centuries.” Milner's Church History, Cent. xvii. ch. i. p. 999. (Ed. in one Vol.)

³ *Ib* p. 684.

as I do, of the Turkish woe,—should have otherwise expounded the vision. And it will not be useless, I think, or irrelevant to my great object of opening the Apocalypse, just to pause, ere we go forward in our subject, and mark how the error originated, and was continued:

It was with Mr. Mede then, if I mistake not, that it *originated*. The *earliest* protestant interpreters, as Leo, Juda and Bullinger for example, did explain this the sun-illumined covenant-Angel's descent to signify the Reformation. But Mede, fixing his eye chiefly, and almost exclusively, on that one symbol in the vision, the *little Book* opened in the hand of the Angel, and fancying a parallelism, which in fact existed not, between it and the *Book* that began to be opened by the Lamb at the commencement of the Apocalyptic revelation, concluded inconsiderately, that whatever character attached to the one, must attach to the other also; and consequently that, as the Book in the *Lamb's* hand was a *prophetic roll*, inscribed with the events of the future history of Christendom, such was also the Book in the hand of the *Angel*. To this idea all else was made to bend in his interpretation. An involved and self-inconsistent structure of the Apocalypse was adopted in accordance with it. The Lamb's Book, or βιβλιον, (though not a hint was given, when first it was seen, of its being any thing less than the whole of the prophecy,) was yet supposed to be only one half of it:—in effect, to be the Book of the *secular* fortunes of Christendom; while the Angel's Book, or βιβλιαριδιον, was that of the fortunes of the *Church*. Further, as to all the magnificent circumstances of the vision before us, they were explained as the mere dramatic accompaniments, and introductory ceremonial, of this new division of the prophecy.—But was there in truth any real parallelism between the two cases? How was it that Mr. Mede overlooked this marked distinction, that the opening of that which was really the prophetic Book was *gradual*, just as the visions developed it, whereas this little Book appeared already opened when

first displayed in the hand of the Angel? ¹ How that he omitted observing that the one was exhibited as being opened in the *inner sanctuary*, a scene representative of the heaven of God's presence, and its blessed inmates, the other as opened on *this world's theatre*? Agreeably with which distinction, the unrolling of the former was to be regarded as having its fulfilment on the day of St. John's being in the Spirit in Patmos, and in the very fact of the then exhibition of these apocalyptic prefigurations of things future before heaven's blessed company and St. John; the latter (*like every thing else enacted outside of the inner sanctuary*) as the figure of some event or fact that would happen on the Roman earth, in the *manner* and in the *order of things* prefigured. So it was, however, that Mede did overlook these important distinctions. And the series of errors resulting should remain impressed upon the inquirer as one proof, among many, both of the necessity of attention to every minute peculiarity of description, in order to a right understanding of the Apocalypse; and also of the admirable, the divine construction of the prophetic drama; in which each minute feature *as* exhibited, and each scenic locality *where* exhibited, have alike so significant a meaning. In truth, like every other work of God, it approves itself to be perfect; and that nothing can be taken from it, as nothing can be added to it.

As to the *continuation* of the error, (for so it was that of the best known succeeding commentators Mr. Dabuz alone ² held to the truer explication,—Vitringa, Sir I. Newton, Bishop Newton, and afterwards Faber, Frere, Cuninghame, &c., all in succession interpreting the *βιβλιαριδιον* on the same principle with Mede, until at

¹ It seems to me quite plain, that had the little Book constituted a new division of the prophecy, ranging through chapters xi, xii, xiii, &c., as Mede supposes, it would have appeared closed in the first instance, and unrolling only as the visions in those chapters proceeded.

² Of other less known interpreters, later than Mede, who applied this vision, (like Bullinger, &c., before him,) in a general way to the Reformation, I may specify the *Rev. Arthur Dent*, in his *Ruine of Rome*: a book published A. D. 1644, four years after Mede's death.

length, of late years, Mr. Keith and a few others¹ recurred to the older view,) we can scarcely be wrong in ascribing it in considerable measure to the authority of Mede's great name.—At the same time it seems to me that what was much more influential in perpetuating it, was the apparent and unobviated difficulty of expounding the long *sequel* of the vision, consistently with any explanation which referred its opening clause, and the symbol of the little Book depicted in it, to the Reformation.—Nor, as I am now bound to confess, is the difficulty yet removed. The later interpreters to whom I have alluded as correct in their *general* view, have not succeeded better than the earlier on this head. Whether in respect of the *seven thunders*, or of *other details* following in the vision, the expositions that they offer consist ill, one and all, with that which we alike advocate of its opening clause;—indeed so ill as to reflect back doubt and obscurity even upon our explication of the opening clause itself.

And hence on the whole the necessity, or at least great desirableness, of not only throwing light on the obscurities of what follows in the prophecy, (the which I shall hope to do in the chapters following,) but of adding confirmation to the historical exposition of its commencement, just given. Nor,—thanks be to God's providential care over the records known by Him to be illustrative of it,—is the additional proof that we might reasonably desire on so important a point wanting. The fact is, there exists what I may call *documentary*, and indeed almost *ocular* evidence of it, to my own mind singularly striking. It is such, I think, as will not only satisfy us as to the justness of our reference of the opening clause of the vision generally to the Reformation; but will connect it, by certain most remarkable chronological and historical coincidences, with that wonderful event's precise epoch of commencement. Yet more, it will serve as a guide and index to prepare us for observ-

¹ In this I believe Messrs. Bicheno and Addis preceded Keith. Mr. Bickersteth and others followed.

ing in all that follows of the vision,—even down to the Witnesses' ascent and fall of the tenth part of the Great City in Apoc. xi. 12, 13,—the orderly prefiguration, point by point, of each chief subsequent step of progress in the Reformation. For as that event is of all others that have happened since apostolic times in Christendom, the grandest and most glorious,—so it is of all others prefigured most fully and circumstantially in the apocalyptic prophecy.

CHAPTER III.

EPOCH OF ANTICHRIST'S TRIUMPH THE EPOCH OF CHRIST'S INTERVENTION.

“And I saw a mighty Angel descending from heaven, clothed with a cloud: and the rainbow was upon his head; and his face was as the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire, and he had in his hand a little book opened. And he set his right foot on the sea, and his left on the land; and cried with a loud voice, as a lion roareth?”

Let me, in introduction to what follows, remind the reader of that principle of *allusive reference*, in visions figuring CHRIST'S revelations of himself to his true church, to something opposed to it and Him, which we have seen exemplified very strikingly already twice in this Commentary; viz. first in the *sealing vision* of Apoc. vii.,¹ secondly in the *incense-offering vision* of Apoc. viii.² Such then having been the case previously,³ it is natural for the question to arise in the inquirer's mind, whether perchance there may not be here also, on occasion of this *third* representation of Christ on the Apocalyptic scene,

¹ See Vol. i. pp. 240—253.

² See Vol. i. pp. 298—316.

³ In the contrast of God's 144,000 sealed ones in Apoc. xiv. and the Beast's sealed ones in Apoc. xiii,—that of Babylon and Jerusalem,—and that of the Bride and the Harlot, we see the same principle of contrast kept up *afterwards* also: only in these latter cases *expressly*, not *allusively*.

some such *allusive reference and contrast*: the rather because there appears in the action of the Angel, whether as regards his planting of his feet on earth and sea, or his roaring as a lion, a singular abruptness and decision; in no way so simply explicable, it might seem, as by the supposition of reference to some signal usurpation of his rights at the time figured, and the triumph of some enemy and rival. Thus we are led to inquire, whether, at the epoch just before the Reformation, there was any such signal triumph of antichristian usurpation and usurper in Christendom? Whether ANTICHRIST, *the ANTICHRIST* of Daniel, St. Paul, and St. John, had really risen in the Church visible; (for he it is of whom we must needs think when such usurpation is hinted;) and not only advanced pretensions to the place of the Lord Jesus in it, but succeeded in establishing them? Also whether, just at the said epoch, his triumph was so signalized as to furnish any remarkable *parallelism of particulars*, in contrast with those that accompanied Christ's emblematic appearance and descent, in the vision now before us; parallelisms such as we verified in the cases of the sealing and incense-offering visions, from comparison of their details with certain prominent characteristics of the apostacy at the times prefigured.

The which suggestion and inquiry direct us at once to *Rome*. For with Rome and its seven hills prophecy, we saw, in our early glances at it, prospectively connected Antichrist.¹ There, moreover, and in the person of *its bishops*, we noticed suspicious symptoms of the development of Antichrist, some nine centuries before the times now under review.² There, in the historical sketch prefixed to the vision of the Turkish Woe,³ we expressed a presumptive belief of his being enthroned and ruling, at the bisecting chronological point of those nine centuries. And though in the sketch of the Middle Ages, given in the chapter last but one preceding this, we did not

¹ Vol. i. pp. 200, 360. Of course a fuller inquiry will be needed into these prophecies of Antichrist, and will in the next, or 4th part of my Work be given.

² Vol. i. 381—384.

³ Vol. i. p. 442.

directly advert to the point, yet it was evident, from the moral and religious corruptions of Western Christendom, as subordinated to Rome, and their support and fostering by the Romish bishops,¹ that everything there noted tended to corroborate the impression, not to negative it. —Thither then let us pass in imagination; and observe what may be enacting at Rome, and by the Pope, at the epoch and crisis that we have supposed alluded to in the vision of the text;—the crisis that immediately preceded the Reformation.

And behold the historic records of the times referred to represent to us, just at this epoch, a scene in that seven-hilled city of high triumph and festival. There has been recently a new election to the Popedom. The announcement was made at the time from the window of the conclave of Cardinals: “I tell you tidings of great joy: a new Pope is elected, Leo the X:”² and the festivities began, on his coronation at St. Peter’s, immediately after. But the grander ceremonial of his going to take possession of the church of his bishoprick, St. John Lateran,—that church by the bishoprick of which, as the mother and mistress of all churches, he is to be constituted not only bishop of Rome, but, by consequence, of the church universal,—was delayed for a month, to allow of the proper pomp attending it.³ And now the day is come for its celebration. The city is thronged with visitors on the occasion. Besides the

¹ See pp. 10—28 *suprà*, *passim*.

² “Gaudium magnum nuncio vobis. Papam habemus Reverendissimum Dominum Johannem de Medicis, qui vocatur Leo Decimus.” This was the usual form of announcement. Roscoe’s *Leo X*, ii. 174, 409. (3rd Ed.)

It is curious that on Leo’s promotion to the Cardinalate, when only thirteen years old, some 25 years before, Ficinus thus wrote: “Semen Johannis ejusdem,” (viz. of Lorenzo of Medici) “in quo benedicuntur omnes gentes, est Johannes Laurentiæ genitus: cui adhuc adolescentulo divina Providentia mirabiliter cardineam contulit dignitatem, futuri Pontificii augurium.” *Epist. ix.* p. 159, (Venet. 1495,) given in M’Cric’s *Italy*, p. 11.

³ For authority in regard of this ceremonial, the reader is referred to the interesting, curious, and full account given by a Florentine physician, I. I. De Pen- nis, who was an eye-witness of it. It was addressed to the Countess of Piero Ridolphi, sister to Leo X: and the only copy of it preserved is in the Vatican. It is given as No. 70, in the Appendix to Roscoe’s *Leo the X*.

hierarchy of Rome, there appear many of the independent princes of Italy; ambassadors also from most of the states of Western Christendom, and moreover the episcopal and ecclesiastical deputies that have assembled to represent the church universal in the General Council now holden at the Lateran; a Council convoked a year since by Pope Julius, (in opposition to the French king's *Conciliabulum*, or *Private Council*, held at the time at Pisa,) and which has already been advanced through five Sessions.—The concourse from early morn has been to the great square before St. Peter's. There the procession forms on horseback, and thence puts itself in motion: its course being across the bridge of St. Angelo, through the heart of the city, to the Lateran church at its opposite extremity. First in order is a troop of cavalry; then a long line of the gentry and nobility; then successively the senators of Rome, a file of Florentine citizens and other provincials, the Pope's body-guard, and a second file of provincial barons and gentry; then the envoys from Germany, Spain, Portugal, and other parts of Christendom; then abbots, bishops, archbishops, and patriarchs, above 250; then the cardinals:—the ecclesiastical dignitaries wearing their jewelled mitres and their copes; the rest drest in richest costumes, and with banners streaming, as on a day of Jubilee:—then, at length, thus preceded, and duly followed and closed in by a troop of military, Himself the *Hero*, (is it not rather the *God*?) of the day, Himself the POPE! The horses of the bishops and cardinals preceding him are covered from head to foot with white trappings.¹ He comes forth Himself too on a white horse: a cope of

¹ Of the bishops' horses it is said, "i cavalli coperti di guarnello bianco; excepti li occhi, donde vedeano." Of the cardinals'; "cavalli coperti, fino in terra, di taffeto biancho." lb. 415. It was *white* for the occasion, and of course by Papal order. The usual colour for the cardinals' horse-trappings was now *scarlet*. Long appropriated to the Pope, the privilege had been accorded by Paul II, in 1463, to the cardinals, to use the same colour. Wadd. p. 645.

Compare, generally, on this subject of the processional, the *Ordo* for a new Pope's inauguration given in Martene De Rit. ii. 88—90. The comparison will be both interesting and elucidatory.—Compare too the account of Gregory IX's inauguration, A. D. 1227, given in Waddington p. 415.

richest broidery mantling him ;¹ the ring of espousal with the Universal Church glittering on his right-hand finger ;² and on his head the regno, or imperial tiara of three crowns.³ A canopy is borne over him by the chief Roman authorities. The streets are strewed with tapestry and flowers for him to pass over. The welkin rings with acclamations of welcome. The multitudes fall on their knees, as he approaches, to receive his benediction. “It seemed to me,” says the narrator of the pageant, “that it was the Redeemer of mankind on the Palm-

¹ Penni does not give the colour of the “*richissimo piviale*” of the Pope. Martene seems to imply that the same *white robe* was still worn, that was previously worn by him in a preliminary service at St. Peter’s. For, on occasion of his public sitting in the vestibule of St. Peter’s, in the interval between the service and the procession, he states the custom of the Cardinal Deacon disrobing him of his pontifical *mitre*, and placing on his head the *crown* or *regno*, instead ; but does not mention any other disrobing. The *white*, however, was not invariable : and the *richissimo* of Penni may rather perhaps indicate the rich *purple* which the Pope often wore in his processions. So Bernard’s description, in his *De Considerat.* iv. 3, address to Pope Eugenius : “*purpuratus incedens, gemmis ornatus, vectus equo albo.*” And so Gregory IX, on his inauguration. Wadd. p. 415.—Compare Apoc. xix. 11—14. “I saw heaven opened ; and behold a white horse, and him that sate upon it. . . . And on his head were many crowns And he was clothed in a garment dipped in blood. . . . and the armies of heaven followed him upon white horses,” &c.

² This was put on the ring-finger of the right hand in the preceding ceremonial service ; and is expressly specified by Martene as to be worn by the newly-elected Pope in the procession : “*Papa habebit anulum Pontificalem.*”—As to the ceremony of putting it on, we thus read : “*Consecratione manuum factâ, consecrator immittit anulum in digitum annularem dextræ manûs Papæ consecrati, dicens ; ‘Accipe anulum, fidei scilicet signaculum ; quatenus sponsam Dei, viz. sanctam universalem ecclesiam, intemeratâ fide ornatus illibatè custodias.’*”

³ On this *regno*, or *Papal Imperial crown*, see Ducange on the word, and his Supplement. I abstract from thence mainly what follows.

It has been said by some that this was originally given the Pope about A. D. 500 by the Frank king Clovis ; and that from thenceforward the Popes used it in public processions. But this, says G. Rhodig. de Liturg. is incorrect ; and that it was not so used by them till after the seventh century. In Baronius ad Ann. 1159, it is described as “*mitra turbinata cum coronâ* ;” Alexander III having just then added the first corona to the mitra : in an Epistle of which Pope soon after, it is described as “*regnum quod ad similitudinem cassidis ex albo fit indumento.*” Afterwards a second crown was added to it by Boniface VIII, about 1303 ; and a third by Urban V, A. D. 1362. And so it became a triple crown : as the Roman Ceremoniale has it ; “*Tiam, quam regnum appellant, triplici coronâ ornatam.*”—It was regarded as signifying the Pope’s *imperial* dignity, in contradistinction to the *mitre* signifying his *sacerdotal* dignity ; and was accordingly never worn by the Pope in church, but only in processions, &c, *without* it. So Innocent III writes, about A. D. 1200 ; “*In signum spiritualium contulit mihi mitram ; in signum temporalium coronam : mitram pro sacerdotio, coronam pro regno.*” and again ; “*Mitrâ semper et ubique (utitur) ; regno nec ubique, nec semper ; quia pontificalis auctoritas et prior est, et dignior, quàm imperialis.*”

Mr. Clarke, in his *Treatise on the Dragon and the Beast*, p. 180, describes its splendor from Platina. And again Ferrario in his *Costumi*, ii. 428.

Sunday going to Jerusalem; there being substituted only for *Hosanna to the Son of David*, the acclamation, *Viva Papa Leone!* Life to the Pope, the Lion!"¹

Strange similitude; although that indeed which his very guise, and pomp, and popular reception, might well have suggested!—But is it really the case that the people regard him as filling the place of Christ to them; and to be looked to as their Redeemer and Saviour? The answer is ready in every mouth. It dwells on the exalted station of the Pope, even more than on the personal character of Leo; its authority, power, sacredness, high above that of the kings of this world, being divine rather than human, as of the very VICAR OF CHRIST AND GOD: and on Leo's personal virtues,—his prudence, firmness, decorum of manners, conversancy with worldly affairs, love of splendor, and taste for classic literature and the arts,—chiefly as fitting him for applying the matchless authority of his office of CHRIST'S VICEGERENT, to the glory of Rome, the amelioration of the evils that from without and from within have long afflicted Christendom, and the introduction of a brighter age.²

But the devices and paintings that every where, on triumphal arches, columns, and other decorated erections for the occasion, meet the eye, as it passes onward with the procession, will be the most faithful as well as most graphic expositors of the general state of thought and feeling respecting him.—Are they not splendid, those decorations? And do they not speak, with indubious evidence, the revival of the arts in Italy?—Alas! that they

¹ "Mi pareo quel di che il Redemptore della humana natura andò in Hierusalem el di delle palme: et per iscambio de dire, Osanna Fili David, gridavano, Viva Papa Leone; et, per cambio de ulivi et palme, veste et panni per le strade si vedea." Ib. Roscoe, ii. 430.

² Aldus Manutius, in the dedication of his Plato, printed A. D. 1513, to Pope Leo, thus describes the general feeling on the occasion we speak of.—"Cum primum creatus es Pontifex Maximus, tantam ceperunt voluptatem Christiani omnes ut dicerent, prædicarent, affirmarent, alter alteri, cessatura brevi mala omnia quibus opprimimur, futura bona quæ seculo aureo fuisse commemorant; quandoquidem Principem, Pastorem, Patrem nacti sumus qualem expectabamus, quo nobis miserimis his temporibus maximè opus erat. Audivi ipse meis auribus illis ipsis diebus, ubicunque fui, omnes hæc eadem uno ore dicere et prædicare." He notices, among the grounds of the hopes thus entertained from Leo's Pontificate, his respectability of personal character, high family, vigour of age, the late wonderful geographical discoveries, &c. Ib. App. xcii.

should speak as clearly the revival of heathenism in it. For mark the strange mixture in them of things sacred and profane, of christian saints and heathen demigods; Peter and Paul, Moses and Aaron, Saints Cosmo and Damian, intermingling with Apollos, Mercuries, Minervas! Does it not well illustrate what has been said of the homogeneity and natural fellowship of the *δαίμονια* of Rome modern and Papal, with those of old Pagan Rome? ¹ Does it not exhibit to the very eye what has been called the invincible Paganism of Italy; ² but which was rather the invincible Paganism of apostate Christendom?

But to the point in hand,—the expression of the mind and spirit of the age respecting its newly-elected POPE LEO. And doubtless there are some of the pictures and devices that depict him with reference simply to his *personal* character. Such is that where *Justice* is introduced with her *balance*, and *Virtue* as assaulted by various serpent-formed vices, but delivered by a *Lion*: such that where the *Arts* and *Literature* are represented as rejoicing in their Patron being made Lord of the world. ³—Again there is another painting that depicts him as exercising *patriarchal* functions: I mean that which represents the lately convened General Council in the Lateran Church; the Cardinals and Bishops appearing

¹ See p. 9, &c.—The following from an Ode of Guido Silvester to the Manes of Popes Alexander and Julius, on Leo's accession, given in Roscoe, App. lxxii, will further illustrate this union.

Christe potens rerum, tuque illius innuba Mater,
 Quæ Capitolini verticis alta tenes;
 Et Vaticanæ pater ac vetus accola rupis,
 Petre, Palestino proxima cura Jovi;
 Dique Deæque omnes, quibus esse vel infima cordi
 Nunc Leo, qui vestro est de grege, signa dedit;
 Ne revocate precor stellis, &c.
 Sunt modo apud superos tot millia multa piorum;
 Hoc sinite oro homines numen habere suum.
 Vobiscum est Janus; vobiscum mater Elissa;
 Vobiscum est Hiero, qui triplici ore tonet;
 Vobiscum est vestræ Paulus tutela coronæ, &c.

² "Ce qui était du pays, ce qui ne peut changer, c'est cet invincible paganisme qui a toujours subsisté en Italie." Michellet i. 13.—But it was not of Italy locally, only. We have seen that it was the Paganism of all Christendom at the time.—For further examples see Roscoe, iii. 150, 254, 284.

³ Ib. pp. 434, 432, 424.

seated in it, and the Pope high-throned among them ; with the legend, "Thou shalt put an end to the Council, and be called the Reformer of the Church."¹—But generally the allusion is to his acting as *Christ's representative* : insomuch that there is the application to him alike of the *history, titles, and offices* of Christ our Saviour ; just as if he were indeed, as they say, his very impersonator on earth. So, for the *history*, in that picture of the three Kings of Christendom, like the Magi of old, fixing their eyes intently on a star in the East ; the morning-star evidently, not of Christ, but Leo :²—so in that of Pope Leo sitting, and many Kings kneeling, and presenting gold and silver to him as their offering :—so in another where he sits youthful in age, and in his cardinal's dress, disputing with aged doctors and conquering :³—so in yet another where *Christ* indeed is represented receiving baptism ; but in which the notification of John Baptist as the Patron Saint of Florence, the presence of Saints Cosmo and Damian, saints of the Medici family, and that of two *lions* holding the scroll, plainly indicate that in the Christ there depicted Pope Leo is signified, his supposed impersonator : and in which picture, even Christ's Godhead is ascribed to Leo ; the titular legend inscribed being, "A God wonderful among his saints !"⁴—Then again as to Christ's *offices*, see where Leo is portrayed at an altar, sacrificing, surrounded by his cardinals and bishops ; and the scroll above reads thus, "Tanquam Aaron : " and also in another opposite, where he appears at an altar, kneeling ; with troops armed behind him, and the words written above, "Tanquam Moses." He is in these represented

¹ Ib. p. 426.

² I take this not from Penni, but from a medal struck at Rome on the occasion, and given in Bonanni's *Numismata Pontificum*.

³ It is necessary to the understanding of this to remember that Leo was made Cardinal at the youthful age of 13. Roscoe, i. 24.

⁴ "Mirabilis Deus in sanctis suis." Roscoe, ii. 422.—Even the Lord's Supper was similarly travestied in another painting ; Pope Leo being evidently meant by the Christ, and the Cardinals by the Apostles round him. For, as Pierre D'Ailly, the friend of Gerson argues, the Cardinals were to be considered "the legitimate representatives of the Apostles ;—the Council of the representative of Christ." Wadd. 678.

as, in Christ's place, both the High Priest, Mediator, and Captain of the Church. And the legends beneath tell the expected happy results: the one, "Thine eye is on the ceremonial of divine worship, and now Religion shall have its due observance;" the other, "Thou art the intimate of the Deity, and the enemies of the Christian name shall yield to thee."¹—I may further notice that in which he is represented in the guise of a shepherd fishing; and, having lighted a great fire, as casting into *it* the bad fish he has drawn in his net, and returning the good into the river: the legend "Non desinam usque ad unum," declaring that he will do that which the Son of Man has asserted it his prerogative to do; viz. to separate between the good and bad, and of the latter to leave not an individual undetected or unadjudged to the fire.²—As to the general hopes of prosperity and happiness they are elsewhere thus symbolized. From a *ball*, the heraldic ensign of Leo, an ear of corn appears to spring, and a grape-cluster of size extraordinary: such as poets describe to have been produced in the fabled Saturnian age; and such perhaps as, according to the traditionary report of Papias, might answer to St. John's prediction of the fruitfulness of the earth in the millennium:—the legend beneath indicating this new *Vicergerent of Christ* as its introducer, and that now at length its golden age was come.³

There are yet *three* other paintings of him in this character, which, on account of their singularly illustrative bearing on the prophecy before us, demand a separate and particular attention. First that in the Genoese arc between the castle of St. Angelo and the Vatican. Here behold the azure heaven represented. On its verge, refulgent with glory like as the new-risen *sun*, stands portrayed the Pope: a *rainbow* in the air reflects its cheering radiance on a landscape of land and water, men and women, just emerged apparently out of night and tempest, below: and the sentence appears written underneath,

¹ Ib. p. 427.² Ib. 425.³ "Aureæque Vitæ Sæculum." 426.

“*The world hath been unveiled to light ; the King of glory has come forth !*”¹—Next comes that painting in the arc of the Florentines. The Pope is here represented with *one foot on the land, the other on the sea* ; having a key moreover in his right hand with which he opens heaven, and in the other another key ; (the key of hell, or perhaps of purgatory ;) and beneath the legend, “*In thy hand I behold the empire of earth, and sea, and heaven.*”²—Have we not in these two pictures of the pageant the very counterpart to the opening emblems of the

¹ Ib. 417. “Era il papa in un cielo infra dui rami di palme ; et dalla dextra mano un Sancto Pietro et un Sancto Paulo, che parlavan col dicto Papa ; et da l'altra mano si vedea un angelo sonare una tromba ; et havea nella banderiola della tromba l'arme Pontificia. Sotto a questo si vedea uno arco, cioe Iris, et sotto l'arco montagne, fiumi, pianure, arbori, uomini, et donne ; et un brevicello che dicea, *Apertus est orbis, et exiit Rex Gloriæ.*” Penni does not mention what kind of glory attached to the Pope in the picture ; but that it was the *solar* glory is plainly implied in the explanatory legend. For the *opening* or *unveiling of the world*, is a poetical phrase to express the emergence of the terrene landscape into light and visibility, on the sun-rising. “Sol orbem radiis reteggit, aperit, &c.” will be remembered by the classic reader, as common Latin phrases. The *exiit* too seems borrowed from what is said of the sun's *going forth* in Psalm xix. 6 ; and the *solar rainbow* implied the *solar shining*.

To understand the consistency and connexion with the above *device* of *Christ's* title, “the King of Glory,” applied in the legend to the Pope, it might suffice to remember that the *sun* too is a frequent *scripture* emblem of Christ. Besides which I would further remind the reader that in that Paganized phraseology of the day, to which I have already alluded, the *divine Son* was blasphemously denominated *Apollo*, (as God the *Father* was *Jupiter*,) doubtless as being God of the *sun*. (Roscoe iii. 150)

Nothing can better illustrate and confirm what has been above said of the *device* in the Genoese painting, than the ode of Zenobius Acciaiolus, given by Roscoe, App. No. cci. It is entitled, “Ode quæ Leo X, Luminare majus Ecclesiæ, Soli seu Apollini comparatur.” The following verses occur in it. I shall have to quote others afterwards, in developing the sense of the symbol.

Flecte nunc versus, age mens canenti,
 Numen ut sacri recinam Leonis ;
 Quem parem Dîo, similemque Soli,
 Mundus adorat.
 Nempe cum visens Laterana templa,
 Movit ex imo veniens ad altos
 Romuli colles, manifesta Solis
 Fulsit imago.

Compare too the language of Cardinal Ægidius ; “Videmus te Leone principe fieri, quæ fecit cum *se terris ostendit* Leo de tribu Judæ &c :” quoted by Bonanni i. 168 :—also the verse,

Cùm primùm nostro illuxit Leo Maximus orbi ;
 in the piece entitled *Simia ad Leonem*, Roscoe Append. lxxxviii.

² Ib. 426. “Nel primo octangulo si vedea un Papa che tenea un piede sopra a terra et l'altro nel mare ; et havea nella man dextra una chiave colla quale apriva el cielo, et nella sinistra un' altra chiave : et dricto a lui si vedea la nobile citta Florida elevata in acre ; et sotto a questo di tal tenore il breve era ; *Elevata sum, quia penes te patriæ, parentum, maris, terræ, cælique regnum esse conspicio.*”

vision before us?—Yet again the *lion* there, as here, appears prominently and repeatedly as a symbol in the devices. For instance, in the triumphal arc near the bridge of St. Angelo, there appear two *lions*, each with one foot on the Papal insignia, to designate that it is the Pope they symbolize, the other on the *mundane globe*; ¹ and with the legends, as the cry uttered by them, “*The prey is worthy of my glory!*” and, “*To me the charge belongs!*” With which last we may associate that in the Via Pontificum, where a Pope sits enthroned, and two kings, having cast their crowns before him, kneel and worship. These a *lion* is represented as blandly licking and fondling. But on other two that appear armed and hostile in the distance, another *lion* seems as about to spring; and the motto, “*Prostratis placidus, Rebellibus ferox,*”² proclaims, as with lion’s roar, that submission, implicit submission, is the law of this pontifical empire.

Such is the triplet of counterpart paintings, in this Leonine pageant, in contrast with the Apocalyptic triplet of symbols in the vision before us. And from their mere specification the Reader will see that it was not without reason that I spoke of them as demanding a full and separate consideration.—Before entering on this, however, let us just trace the processional to its termination. And let us mark, in doing so, the almost ostentatious exhibition in it of Christ’s degradation and nothingness, as contrasted with the Pope’s exaltation:—him whom having now viewed not only as head of the apostacy,³ but as the blasphemous usurper also of Christ’s place in the church, we need no longer hesitate to call the *Papal*

¹ Penni (418) calls this a *palla*, or *ball*, but is plainly mistaken. The legends decide the symbol. It was no *heraldic ball* that could be a prey worthy of the Papal glory, but the *ball of the earth* only.—In another *leonine* painting in the pageant, one in which a Lion appeared to have delivered Virtue assaulted by serpent-formed Vices, an Angel was represented as crowning the Lion. Bonanni gives a medal, struck at Rome on the occasion, in which the two devices are united;—viz. that of the lion’s having his paw on the terrene globe, and of the Angel’s crowning him. Of this, as a very interesting illustration of our subject, especially because of the legend round it, (*The Lion of the tribe of Judah, &c.*) I append a copy.

² Ib. 425.

³ See Vol. I. p. 381—382.

POPE LEO X. AS THE LION OF THE TRIBE OF JUDAH.



From Bonanni's Numismata Pontificum

Antichrist. I say let us mark the contrast exhibited between them. For Christ too is present, they tell us, to swell the triumph of the day. His place they point out under yon canopy, upon the white palfrey, just before the line of bishops; some five-and-twenty attendants being disposed, each with kindled wax-light, round him, and the sacristan as his guard behind. It is that box, they say, which the gold brocade covers that holds him. There is the holy eucharist,—the consecrated wafer. That is CHRIST.¹—Oh foul dishonor to their Lord! *He* appears but as a state-prisoner, to add to the brilliancy of the pageant; a puppet in the hands of the priesthood!

Meanwhile in all the pomp of the processional, and with each of the magnificent decorations that adorn it² symbolizing his glory, with every eye fixed upon him, and every knee bent before him, the POPE advances on his triumph.—And so, at length, the Lateran is arrived at; that Church with which the Papal episcopate is connected, and in the portico of which, as justificatory of its asserted universal jurisdiction, an old marble records its dignity as the mother and head of all churches.³ And as, on the setting out, his studied mimicry of Christ was observable, and the paintings too and the legends reminded the passer-by, that, “the heaven-sent One,”⁴ “the King of Glory,” was gone forth, so at this close

¹ “Sequia una bianchissima chinea, et sopra del dorso suo havea un tabernaculetto adornato di brochato d'oro, nel qual dentro si posava la sacra Eucharistia; et di sopra era un bellissimo baldacchino, et circumcirca forsa venticinque parafrenieri, con torce di purissima cera bianca accense in mano, et dritto li il sacrista con un baculo ligneo in mano, per custodia di Christo.” Ib. 414.

² Guicciardini observes on this festival, that it was universally believed that Rome had never seen a more superb and magnificent day since the inundation of the barbarians; that the expence was not less than 100,000 ducats; and that the magnificent parade confirmed the vulgar in their expectations of happiness, under the Pontificate of one who so abounded in liberality, and delighted in splendor. Vol. vi. p. 116. (Engl. Transl.)

³ The following is the inscription:

Dogmate Papali datur, et simul imperiali,
Ut sim cunctorum mater et caput ecclesiarum.

Also the words, “Sacrosancta ecclesia Lateranensis omnium ecclesiarum mater et caput.” Moreri Dict. Art. *Lateran.*

⁴ “Leo. X. Pont. Opt. *De Cælo Misso* Gentiles Civesque Sui Numini Ejus Devoti,” was the legend of one of the Florentine paintings. Roscoe, p. 423. The

of the procession, the studied mimicry continues. Dis-mounting at the church vestibule the Pope takes sitting for a moment, as if in great humility, on a lowly seat placed for the occasion :¹ then, amidst the chanting of, "He raiseth the poor from the dust to make him inherit the throne of glory,"² he is raised from it by some of the officials of the church, led up the nave, and seated on the Papal throne within. They call it his *assumption*, or *taking up* : as if, like that of one before him, to the elevation, not of a mere earthly throne, but a heavenly ; and with all power given to him in heaven and on earth.³

And now I revert to the three remarkable symbolizations of the Papal Antichrist above-noted. And considering how exactly they answer to the triple symbolization of *Christ*, in the Apocalyptic vision before us,—*his* face too being depicted as the *sun*, and with an investing *rainbow*, *his* feet as planted on *land and sea*, *his* voice

representation of Leo as a special *envoy from heaven*, was a frequent conceit of the times : e. g. in Vitalis Castalio's Verses on this occasion ; (Ib. App. lxxi.)

Jam novus in terras alto descendit Olympo
Jupiter.

¹ There were three seats so used, one of white earth, two of porphyry ; each with holes in, and called *stercoraceæ*, (!) in order to answer the Vulgate, "De stercore erigit pauperem." See Martene ii. 89.

² The verse is from Hannah's song, 1 Sam. ii. 8 : which song, from the mention of God's anointed in verse 10, and from the Virgin Mary's appropriation of much of it in her hymn of praise on the annunciation, has both by Rabbinical commentators, as Kimchi, and also by Christian, been generally supposed to have a reference to Christ. See Patrick's Note ad loc.

³ *Assumption* is the usual word applied to the elevation to the Papal dignity. So in the French king's mandate in the Lateran Council: "Leone ad summi Apostolatus apicem, atque universalis ecclesie regimen, assumpto." (Hard. ix. 1710, 1729.) In the *Glyptiques et Numismatiques* by Achille Collas, lately published at Paris, there is given a medal struck in France, on occasion of Leo's election to the Pontificate, in which Leo's head is on one side, the Papal arms on the obverse, with the Legend "*Gloriâ et honore coronasti eum* ;" and the notice added, "Ex ejus *assumptione* universa Resp. Christiana maximam perceptit voluptatem."

The application of the word to the Virgin Mary's *assumption*, and to Christ's, will remind the reader of its general indication, when used *by itself*, of a *heavenly ascension*. And considering that it is continually thus applied *by itself* to the Papal elevation, and also the almost universal appropriation of things concerning Christ to the Popes, we can scarcely be wrong in here construing the term as intended to suggest the allusion noted in the text. Compare Phil. ii. 7—9.

Let me add that Christ's Ascension is the subject painted on the vault above the great transept of the Lateran Church : and that from its portico the Pope blesses the people on the festival of Ascension-day. Nibbi Itin. de Rome, i. 186, 183.

as a *lion's* roaring,—considering further the *chronological coincidence* of the one emblematic figuration and the other, the one in the prophecy, the other in history,—and yet again the fact, already twice exemplified, of *allusive contrast* to that which would at any particular epoch be opposed to and usurpatory of his prerogative, being a feature observable in the chief Apocalyptic pre-figurations of Christ's intervention, (as well as in the actual interventions corresponding, of the one of which here intended I shall speak in my next chapter)—considering all this, I might perhaps at once make my appeal to the Reader, and ask, without fear of contradiction, Is it credible that the parallel and the contrast were in this case either unforeseen or unintended by the Eternal Spirit?—But the full *signification* of the three devices needs yet to be unfolded. Also it needs to be shown that what they signified, as to the Papal prerogative, was not the mere exaggeration of popular fancy or feeling at Rome, on a festival day of excitement, but *realities*, such as the Apocalyptic vision, when allusive, can alone allude to. To this therefore I shall now address myself : although to do it, and to furnish in each case the illustrative historical facts requisite, will necessarily occupy us some considerable time. But the time will not be mispent. Indeed I feel that I should scarce do justice to my subject without thus more fully developing these anti-Apocalyptic devices. For it is impossible that any thing could exhibit to us more strikingly than these do the extent of the Papal usurpation of Christ's glory and prerogatives, just before his glorious intervention in the Reformation ; and the crisis too of Papal triumph, in regard alike of things temporal and things spiritual, of this world and the next.

I. First then as to the *meaning*, and the *acting out*, of that emblematic painting which represented the Pope as the new-risen *sun*, the King of glory, beaming from heaven on this earth, and with the *rainbow*, the covenant-rainbow, as his accompaniment.

Now we are not to suppose that there was merely meant by this a symbolization of the Pope's supreme dignity,¹ and of the happy promise of his reign; so as the symbol of a rising sun and rainbow might have been applied, in the hyperbole of painting or poetry, to designate the hopes entertained from the reign of any other mighty sovereign on his accession:—though this no doubt was included, and the general expectation of happiness from Leo's reign signified by the emblem;² on the scale however of the golden age, fabled and also predicted, as its measure and character.³ Let it be well observed, as inferable both from the accompanying emblem of the *rainbow*, and from the title of “The King of glory,” given to the Pope in the picture, that it was as *Christ's representative* chiefly that the symbol was applied to him; and thus that as Christ was the sun in the christian system, *so* the symbol was meant to designate Pope Leo.—Now of Christ the symbol indicated both the *inherent divine lustre*, as Him in whom was light,—the light of *life, truth, and holiness*,—and in whom no darkness at all: also how out of this light, treasured in infinite fulness in Himself, it pleased Him to *impart* to the children of men: as He said, “I am the light of the

¹ In the Decretals, Pope Innocent III declared the Emperor's power to be as inferior to the Pope's, as the *moon* is inferior to the *sun*. This was one of the propositions extracted from them by Luther, when he burnt the Decretals. Lib. i. tit. 33, chap. vi.

² So in the elegant *Sylva* of Johannes Philomusus Novocomensis, written on Leo's creation, and given in Roscoe, App. No. LXIX;

medio tu sol clarissimus orbe

Largiris patriæ insigni lucemque caloremque.

³ See the quotation from Aldus Manutius subjoined to p. 51. Very similar are the hopeful prognostications of Vitalis Castalio, in Roscoe, App. LXXI.—In the quotation from Aldus, I mentioned among the reasons for all these hopes from Leo's Pontificate the fact, as yet quite recent, of those wonderful discoveries and conquests, almost cotemporaneously with his accession, of countries hitherto unknown, by the kings of Spain and Portugal. This excited the hope, he tells us,—and we find it perpetually dwelt on by the Italian writers of the time,—that under his presidency there would at length be the fulfilment of that ancient prophecy, that there should be finally throughout the world one fold and one shepherd. If christian kings would but unite, he adds, against the infidels, “paucis annis homines ubique terrarum Deum verum cognoscerent, in Jesum constanter crederent, eumque solum adorarent; sed cognoscent, credent, adorabunt, *te Pontifice*.” lb. xcii. p. 484.—I suspect the “*apertus orbis*” of the Genoese Painting had some reference to this auspicious opening of the world before Leo.

world ; he that followeth me shall have the light of life." In this character his glory was recognized, while on earth, as the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of *grace* and *truth* ; and was sung of long previously, in Hebrew prophecy, as that of *the Sun of Righteousness*.—In these same senses, then, we might expect that the symbol was *intended* to apply to Leo. And, in point of fact, in the writings of the time, we find them all expressly noted. We shall presently see how the Portuguese orator addressed him as dispersing the mists of his mind by the *sun-beams* of his *divine* countenance. In similar tone in the Lateran, in presence of the general Council of Christendom, his countenance is spoken of by the chosen orator Puccius, as " beaming from it the insupportable lustre of *divine majesty*."¹ By one of the poets of the day a splendor, dazzling as the sun's, is described as flashing from his triple crown ; with reference to the *divine glory* attached to it of an empire over earth, hell, and heaven.² By the same poet he is elsewhere depicted as the sun's dwelling-place, because of the light of *wisdom* that dwelt with him.³ The Maronite patriarch, and another of the Oriental ecclesiastics, address him in their letters as like the sun or the moon, *full of truth* ; and again as the sun refulgent in

¹ "Divinæ majestatis tuæ conspectus rutilanti cujus fulgore imbecilles oculi mei caligant." This was in the ninth Session of the Council. Hard. ix. p. 1760.

² I refer to the Ode of Zenobius Acciaiulus, addressed to Leo as the "Luminare majus Ecclesiæ," and in which he is compared to *Apollo* or the *Sun*, from which I have already once extracted. It is given by Roscoe in Number CCI of his Appendix. In it the following verses occur :

Ille sed fulgor radios euntis
 Obruit turbæ populique visus ;
 Celsa cum, Phæbo similis, refulsit
 Thensa Leonis.
 Namque gemmato rutilabat auro,
 Triplici surgens obitu coronæ,
 Inferi, summi, et medii potestas
 Inclita mundi.

The classical reader will remember that the *thensa* was the car in which the images of the *gods* were drawn in the processions of the ancient Pagan Romans. So Cicero in Verr. i. 59.

³ Sol, Leo noster ? domus anne Solis ?
 Ipse Sol idem, domus atque Solis :
 Quem sub arcano *sophiâ* nitentem
 Pectore gestat.

holiness.¹—Further he is represented as, like the sun, *imparting* out of this his treasure-house of light to the children of men; not only otherwise as their enlightener,² but chiefly as their *illuminator* in matters of *faith*:³—*revealing* and *opening* to men *the way to heaven*; ⁴ and also shedding a *healing* influence with his beams on the darkness and woes of humanity. In the influence last ascribed to the light of the Papal countenance we see the exact counterpart to that ascribed to Christ's in Malachi's beautiful prophecy just before alluded to;—I mean that in which he speaks of Him as the *Sun of Righteousness*, rising on them that fear Him with *healing* in his wings.⁵

Thus it appears that besides the *inherent* glory of majesty, wisdom, and holiness supposed to reside in

¹ "Sub pedibus Patris nostri sanctissimi, *sanctitate* ut sol renitentis." Again, "Leo Papa. . . sol refulgens, luna *plena veritatis*." The Epistles of the Monk Elias and Maronite Patriarch are given in Harduin ix. 1864, 1867.

Compare the following from the Apology of *Picus of Mirandola*, given in the *Mores Catholici*, viii. 296: "These things (viz. his Books) the Holy See will judge, and sitting thereupon Innocent VIII; to resist whose judgment is impious. He is the Supreme judge on earth, who represents Him that is judge of quick and dead. He is the *dispenser and treasurer of truth*, who stands in the place of Him that is truth itself." Innocent VIII died A. D. 1492: so that the era only just preceded that of Leo X.

² "Noctem oculis, noctem mente excute," is the invocation of the Papal Deity by Franciscus Philomusus. Roscoe, ii. 400.

³ "Quello illuminatore della fede Christiana." Penni, ib. p. 415.—Let me add that on Leo's gold coin, alluded to p. 53 *suprà*, with the device of a *star*, and three kings (of France, Spain, Germany, ib. p. 426) as the three Magi gazing intently, and advancing towards it, there is the motto, "*Lux Vera in Tenebris lucet*."

⁴ So in the *Sylva* of F. Philomusus Novocomensis, already quoted from:

Salve! magne Parens hominum, cui summa potestas,
Summus honos, triplici frontem diademate cingit.
..... cujus de luce supremâ
Celsum iter ad summum nobis aperitur Olympum:
Quemque Deus dedit esse Deum mortalibus ægris.

I must not omit the comment furnished by the Maronite Patriarch, on this ascription to the Pope of the opening of the way to heaven. "Leoni pleno misericordiæ, Vicario Dei; quem Deus sequi nos voluit, januam et *indicem viæ rectæ*; qui videt animas peccatrices, quas et potest e pœnis eripere; cui pro salute, proque viâ salutis, genuflectunt sensus." Hard. ix. 1857.

The reader will not fail to observe how perpetually the Pope was addressed as *God*. Of this more hereafter.

⁵ In the ode of Zenobius, addressed to Pope Leo as Apollo, the double idea of him as the God of *light* and of *healing* is constantly kept in view. So Vitalis;

Quique prius morbi ingruebant mortalibus ægris
Luce Leonini pelluntur Apollinis almâ.

the Pope, the *sun* of Roman Christendom, there were also two principal points of view in which, like Christ, he was believed to *shed forth* from himself this light and glory on mankind; viz. as the dispenser to them of the light of *truth*, i. e. the *true faith*, and the dispenser of the light of *grace* and *salvation*. And to shew the Pope's *actual exercise* in real life of the prerogatives thus falsely assigned him, it needs only that I remind the reader, with reference to the *first*, that in all disputed matters of religious faith and doctrine the ultimate reference was to him, his decision considered final,¹ and even the Bible-statements supposed to derive their authority from him, not his from the Bible:²—also, in regard to the *second*, that it was from him, as the *recognized fountain of divine grace and mercy*, that those *indulgences* proceeded of which I have more than once already spoken: and whereby not the temporal punishments only due to sin were remitted, but the eternal; its guilt blotted out, innocence restored to the sinner, and salvation ensured.—Of the exercise of either of these two supposed Papal prerogatives, it is obviously quite impossible to over-estimate the tremendous efficacy, in support of the system of superstition and error then established. As to that of the latter, more especially, it seems from the accompaniment of the covenant-*rainbow* to have been so expressly intended by the painter, and is in itself so extraordinary, so characteristic of the Papal usurpation of Christ's most glorious spiritual prerogative,³ and so illustrative, by force

¹ See the exemplification of this in Luther's own appeals and deference to the Pope, at the commencement of the Reformation.—In the XVth century, the question had been raised whether the ultimate appeal in questions of *faith*, as well as of *discipline*, was to the Pope or to a General Council. The prerogative was now generally accorded to the Pope. And even supposing it attached to a General Council, the Pope, without whom it could not exist, had such influence over it, that it only spoke as he prompted. See my Chapter on the Image of the Beast, Apoc. xiii. In after times, and especially among the Jansenists, there arose the distinction of questions of *faith* and of *fact*.

² So the Dominican Prierias, head of the Inquisitors at Rome, in his condemnation of Luther's Theses. This was one of the Articles from the Decretals burnt by Luther, in 1520, with the Pope's Bull. Another was; The Pope has the power to interpret Scripture, and to teach, as he pleases; and no one may interpret differently. Scott's Luther, i. 121.

³ "They bereave the Church, the spouse of Christ, of her true comfort, as

of contrast, of the emblematic outburst of the true Sun of Righteousness in the prefigurative vision before us, and of its glorious fulfilment in the Reformation, that I cannot but pause to give the reader a detailed view in real life of the whole process.

For so it was, that just after Leo's *assumption* to the Papal throne, there arose an occasion very notable for the exercise of this divine prerogative of mercy. The design of building St. Peter's, on a scale of magnificence suited to the cathedral of Christendom, devolved to him from his predecessors in the Papacy, and met in his mind with a ready welcome. From the revival of the arts in Italy, and with Michael Angelo, Raphael, and a host of other artists of eminence round him, he found ready at hand all that could be needed of skill and genius for its execution. Money alone was wanting. And whence procurable? He had not, says Michelet, the mines of Mexico. But he had one as productive. His mine was the old superstition, and old superstitious credulity of the people. To it, therefore, he determined to recur, and thence to draw the treasures needed. Accordingly (for such was the occasion, and such the object),¹ he issued bulls of grace and plenary indulgence into all the several countries of western Christendom; containing grants the most lavish of forgiveness of sin and salvation to each receiver.² One condition only was attached; that was that they must *purchase* them. The grace was not to be conferred without *money*.

It was in Germany more especially, that the great excitement was arising.³ It seemed as if a vast fair had been opened in its tranquil towns, one after another; the merchandize offered for sale being the salvation of souls. The Papal commissary here appoint-

taking away the sun out of the world." So P. Hamilton the Reformer, in his *Common Places*; quoted in Middleton's *Biograph. Evangel.* i. 76.

¹ The building of St. Peter's (begun on a scale of great magnificence by Julius II.) is expressly mentioned in the Brief as the object of this issue of indulgences.

² See on the subject of *Indulgences* my earlier notice, Vol. i. p. 380.

³ In what follows I abridge from M. Merle D'Aubigne's very interesting *History of the Reformation*, i. 229, &c.

ed was Tetzal. He was a Dominican, a functionary of the Holy Inquisition, already long practised in the traffic.¹ In the fulfilment of his present commission, his habit was to travel from town to town, in pomp and with a retinue as one of the nobles of the land. Into each town as he approached it, the message was sent, "The grace of God is at your gates." Forthwith the town-council and the clergy, the monks and nuns from the convents, the schools and trades, hastened to form into procession; and with standards and wax-lights in hand, and ringing of the church bells, advanced to meet it; there being as much show of honor paid to it, it is said, as if it had been God himself. On returning, the course of the procession was to the principal church in the town. The Papal Bull was borne on a rich velvet cushion, or cloth of gold; a red cross elevated near it by the commissary; and the chaunting of prayers and hymns, and fuming of incense, kept up as its accompaniment. Arrived at the church, it was received with the sound of the organ. Then, the red cross and Papal arms having been placed by the great altar, the commissary mounted the pulpit. And this is related as the style of his addresses to the assembled people. "Now is the heaven opened. Now is grace and salvation offered. Christ, acting no more himself as God, has resigned all his power to the Pope.² Hence the present dispensation of mercy. Happy are your eyes that see the things that ye see. By virtue of the letters bearing the Papal seal that I offer you, not only is the guilt of past sins remitted, but that of sins that you may wish to commit in future. None is so great, but that pardon is ensured to the purchaser.³

¹ He had been employed in the sale of Indulgences from the year 1502.

² "Le Seigneur notre Dieu n'est plus Dieu. Il a remis tout pouvoir au Pape." Merle D'Aub. i. 233.

³ "*Pudet referri*," says Fabroni, "quæ ipse (Tetzal) et dixit et fecit; quasi legatus à cælo missus fuisset, ad quodlibet piaculum expiandum atque purgandum." So Fabroni. But it is to be remembered that in all this Tetzal acted under the instructions and the eye of the Archbishop, the Pope's copartner; by whom, even after Luther's appeal to him, no disapprobation of them was expressed. Indeed by Cardinal Cajetan, after the matter had proceeded so far as to induce the direct Papal interference in the matter, nothing was objected to Tetzal. Instead of this he expressly asserted and confirmed the received doctrine of indulgences.

And not the sins of the living only, but of the dead in purgatory.¹ As soon as the money sounds in the receiving box, the soul of the purchaser's relative flies from purgatory to heaven. Now is the accepted time, now the day of salvation. Who so incensate, who so hard-hearted, as not to profit by it? Soon I shall remove the cross, shut the gate of heaven, extinguish the *bright sunbeams of grace* that shine before you.² How shall they escape that neglect so great salvation?"—Then the confessionals are set, each with the Papal arms attached. The confessors dilate on the virtue of the indulgences. The penitents crowd to the purchase. For the mass are sunk in superstition and ignorance, the willing slaves of delusion. And others there are too with whom, amidst all their superstition, the voice of conscience is awake; and whom the fear of death, and distress at God's hiding Himself, impel to seek as they may, for pardon and reconciliation. Was not Myconius's case the case of many like him?³ To such it seemed indeed strange that the grace of God should be purchased for money. And some, revolted by it, turned away. But with others the doubt was silenced by the thought of the indulgence coming from *God's Vicar*, the Pope; even yet more than by the influence of long-established custom. Could the *Vicar of Christ* deceive or err?—So they crowd to the purchase. The price is from 25 ducats to a half florin,⁴ according to the rank and opulence of the purchaser. The money-box of the Dominican is filled. Having deducted his own percentage for agency, and paid his reckoning at the inn with indulgences for the deliverance of three or more souls out of purgatory, according to its greater or less amount,

¹ Compare the painting of the Pope with the two keys of heaven and purgatory in his hand. Also the Maronite Patriarch's description of him, as "qui videt animas peccatrices, quas et potest à pœnis eripere," given in a Note preceding, p. 62.

² This was at Annaberg, and is related by Myconius. "Bientôt je fermerai la porte du ciel, j'éteindrai l'éclat de ce soleil de grace qui reluit à vos yeux." Merle. 243.

³ See the History in Merle D'Aub. ib.

⁴ From about £5 to 1s. Tetzel was famous for his rapid discrimination of the rank of the purchaser, and his proportioning the price accordingly.

he transmits the surplus to the Prince Archbishop of Mayence and Magdeburgh, whose agent he is, and whose rules he has been following in the business ; then proceeds on the same blasphemous mission to another town. And, as between the Archbishop and the Pope there has been an agreement for the bipartition of the receipts from this part of Germany, the moiety of the money flows to ROME,—the price of the merchandize of souls. Thus the cheat has been consummated. The rays of this mock Sun of Righteousness, the Papal Antichrist, have gone forth only to fructify in his own coffers. Meanwhile the poor deluded people, cherishing the indulgences they have purchased ¹ as a guarantee of forgiveness and salvation, live, and perhaps die, with a lie in their right hand. And as regards JESUS, robbed as he has been by the Usurper of his own most glorious attribute of mercy, oh, who shall tell the magnitude of the insult put upon Him ?

2. Next would we learn the meaning, and its realization in actual life, of that most striking representation of the Pope, in the Florentine triumphal arc, as *fixing*

¹ The following is a copy of one of Tetzel's Indulgences, as translated by Dr. Robertson :—

“ May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee, by the merits of his most holy passion ! And I by his authority, that of his blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and of the most holy See, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first, from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred ; and then from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be, even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the Apostolic see. And as far as the keys of the church extend, I remit to you all punishment which you deserve in purgatory on their account ; and I restore you to the holy sacraments of the church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which you possessed at baptism : so that, if you should die now, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the paradise of delights shall be opened. And if you shall not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when you are on the point of death. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

The apparent ambiguity of one or two clauses is abundantly done away with by the decisive language of others. Even in the most ambiguous, “ In so far as the keys of the church extend,” there would appear little ambiguity to the people. For, as the Florentine painting represented the Pope with one key opening heaven, and having in the other hand another key, that of purgatory, so it was not doubted by the people at the time, that the Pope's power of the keys was absolute, even to the extent Tetzel stated.

one foot on the land and another on the sea, how can we better satisfy ourselves than by marking what passed at Rome in the second year of Leo's pontificate,¹ on occasion of an embassy arriving from the king of Portugal? The ambassador was a General celebrated for his part in the late conquests of the Portuguese in the far Indies. In testimony of them he brought, among other most magnificent presents to the Pope Leo, animals from the East, the leopard, the panther, and the elephant;—animals unknown to the citizens of Rome since the time and shows of its imperial grandeur. And great was the popular admiration as these presents were led in procession through the streets of Rome; more especially when, on arrival before the pontifical presence, the elephant, as if with more than instinct, stopt, and knelt, and thrice bowed himself as in act of adoration to the ground.²—But listen to the orator of the embassy.³ For a moment he hesitates, as overcome by a sense of the majesty of him he is addressing. "Fear and trembling," he exclaims, "have come over me, and a horrible darkness overwhelmed me."⁴ Then, re-assured by the Pope's serene aspect towards him,—“that divine countenance, which shining,” he says, “as the sun, had dispersed the mists of his mind,”⁵—he proceeds to the objects of his mission: narrates the eastern conquests of the Portuguese arms; addresses the POPE as the Supreme Lord of all; and speaks of these conquests as the incipient fulfilment of God's sure promises, “Thou shalt rule from sea to sea, and from the Tyber⁶ river to the world's end;” “the kings of Arabia

¹ It was on March 25, 1514, that audience was given to the embassy. The envoy's name was Tristano Cugna.

² This is celebrated by Aurelius Serenus in his *Theatrum Capitolinum*, given No. lxxxiv. in Roscoe's Appendix, p. 461: “*Ut docile animal,*” he says, “*supplex tuum numen sentiret adoraretque.*”

³ Paccchi. The oration, which was the subject of high commendation, both from the Pope himself and from the Roman writers and literati, is given in full by Roscoe. Appendix No. ci.

⁴ “*Venerunt timor et tremor super me, et contexerunt tenebræ.*”

⁵ “*Inter sacrosanctæ ecclesiæ Romanæ cardines, quasi solem inter sua sidera micantem. . . In tanto fluctuantis animi æstu hærerem procul-dubio, nisi serenus iste divinusque vultus tuus, discusso mentis nubilo, omnes difficultates pervinceret.*”

⁶ So Paccchi.

and Saba shall bring gifts to thee ; yea, all princes shall worship thee, all nations shall serve thee ;” and, under thy auspices, “ there shall be one fold and one shepherd.” That is, he explains the promised universal latter-day subjection of the world to Christ as meant of its subjection to the *Pope* ; and the Portuguese discoveries and victories over the heathen, as signs that that consummation was at hand.—Thus does he well illustrate to us what was *intended* by the Florentine device under consideration ; concluding in the same spirit by a solemn act of adoration to the Pope, as his King’s Lord and Master : “ Thee as the true Vicar of Christ and God, the Ruler of the whole Christian Republic, we recognize, confess, profess obedience to, and adore : in thy name adoring Christ, whose representative thou art.”¹

As to the *acting out* by the Pope of this prerogative of *universal earthly supremacy*, thus both by the painter and the orator assigned him, we might be sure, even prior to examination, that such must have been the case, when it was so obsequiously confessed to, and with such expressions of personal fealty, not by an immediately subject people only, but by a powerful and distant monarch, like him of Portugal. And it needs indeed only to look into European history to find the proof.

Already, four centuries before, Gregory the 7th had put forward pretensions to authority, as Christ’s Vicar, over the kings and kingdoms of the world. Nor in the course of those four centuries had examples been wanting very remarkable of the application of this Papal prerogative, within, and even beyond, the limits of the old Roman earth, European Christendom. So, for instance, in that fateful Bull of Pope Adrian IV, A. D. 1155, whereby on the English King Henry’s *petition*, permission was granted him, agreeably with the Pope’s undoubted right

¹ “ Te verum Christi Vicarium, maximum Romanæ ecclesiæ Pontificem, totius Reipublicæ Christianæ Præsulem, recognoscimus, fatemur, adoramus.” At the beginning of his oration he had said : “ Venimus ab ultimo Lusitaniæ recessu ut te Dei Vicarium, Christianæ religionis summum Antistitem, unicum Romanæ ecclesiæ gregisque Dominici Pastorem veneremur, colemus, atque in tuo nomine Christum, cujus vicem geris, adoremus.”—A letter from the King of Portugal accompanied ; addressed, “ Ad Patrem et Dominum nostrum Leonem X.”

and prerogative over all professedly Christian lands, to subjugate Ireland; on condition only of an *annual quit-rent to the Roman See, of one penny for each house inhabited within it.*¹ And so again, about the middle of the 14th century, in the grant of the Canary Islands, not long before discovered, though beyond the pale of European Christendom, to Prince Lewis of Spain by the Pontiff Clement VI.²—But the Portuguese discoveries along the African coast towards the Cape of Good Hope, and so towards India, begun about the middle of 15th century, and yet more that memorable one by the Spaniards, some 50 years afterwards, of a new world beyond the Western Ocean, gave scope and occasion for its exercise in far distant seas, on a scale immensely larger. For were not the *heathen* promised to Christ for an inheritance, and the *uttermost parts of the earth for a possession*? The application came first from Prince Henry of Portugal to the then reigning Pope, that since, as Christ's Vicar, all kingdoms of the earth were subject to him, he would, in virtue of that authority, confer on the Portuguese crown a right to all countries inhabited by infidels, that they, the Portuguese, might discover: promise being added that he would spread the Christian religion in them, establish the Papal authority, and so increase the flock of the universal pastor. So was the opportunity given, and it was instantly seized on by the Pope, thus magnificently to exercise his supposed prerogative. A Bull was issued granting the Portuguese all they

¹ The Bull is given Harduin vi. ii. 1333. After praising his ambitious design, as if arising from the pious wish of teaching the Christian faith more perfectly to the island's rude inhabitants, it speaks thus of Papal rights. "Sanè Hiberniam et omnes insulas quibus sol justitiæ Christus illuxit, et quæ documenta fidei Christianæ ceperunt, ad jus beati Petri, et sacrosanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ (quod tua et nobilitas recognoscit) non est dubium pertinere." And then Henry's offer of the annual payment is mentioned; and the permission sued forgiven on the express understanding that this bribe should be paid: "jure nimirum ecclesiastico ilibato et integro permanente; et salvâ beato Petro, et sacrosanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, de singulis domibus annuâ unius denarii pensione."

² This I observe noted in Mr. Faber's *Sights and Thoughts*, p. 52; and he mentions that Philip was accordingly crowned King of the Canary Isles at Avignon, where Pope Clement then resided; and walked about the streets afterwards with a crown on his head, a sceptre in hand, and a resplendent train attending him.

might discover, from Cape Non to India.¹—In 1493, after Columbus' discovery of America, a similar application was made by Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain to Pope Alexander the 6th;—the same pleas and promises accompanying it of extending the Pope's empire. And again the grant was made, and in terms still more presumptuous and striking: the Bull enacting, in order that it might not interfere with the grant previously made to the King of Portugal, that an imaginary line from Pole to Pole, drawn so as to pass 100 leagues westward of the Azores, should be the limit between the two nations, and all westward belong to the Spaniards, all eastward to the Portuguese.² And what is very observable is, that in the judgment of the Princes of Western Christendom, these pontifical grants constituted to either nation a title unimpeachable, and a guarantee against interference or attack. When some English merchants were about to open a trade with the coast of Guinea, the Portuguese King having laid before King Edward the 4th the Pope's Bull, as entitling him to it, Edward, satisfied on the point, prohibited his subjects from making the voyage.³ This was before the discoveries of America and of the passage by the Cape of Good Hope.⁴ And after them, and in evidence that the same title still guaranteed to Spain and Portugal those

¹ Robertson's *America*, Vol. i. p. 68.

² *Ib.* p. 160. Zeal for propagating the Christian faith is specified in the Papal Bull, as Alexander's chief motive in granting it. Accordingly missionary friars were sent out with Columbus on his second voyage, one being Apostolic Legate.

Count Bossi, in his Italian Translation of Roscoe, observes that Alexander VI, besides this grant to Ferdinand, had conferred on him the dominions of the king of Navarre; a king whom Alexander had excommunicated previously, and Ferdinand conquered.

Mr. Maitland has expressed surprize that no notice should have been taken in the Apocalypse of the *discovery of America*, supposing it a prophecy prefigurative of what has already occurred in Christendom. See Maitland's *Remarks*; p. 120. For myself, I long since suspected that there was an allusion to that event in the passage under consideration; and cannot but think the suspicion is now justified.

³ Robertson's *America*, Vol. i; *Notes and Illust.* x; p. 358.

⁴ It was not till 1497 that the Portuguese, under Vasco di Gama, discovered and passed the Cape of Good Hope, towards the Indies. The fifty or sixty years preceding, they had, as Robertson observes, been creeping along the coast from Cape Non to Cape de Verd, the latter only twelve degrees south of the former.—Columbus' discovery of America, being in 1492, just preceded that of the Cape of Good Hope.

their later conquests, it has been said that this was the cause of the first efforts of English colonization being directed to the *North* American coasts, and avoiding those of *South* America, as belonging rightfully to Spain.¹—Thus it was not without reason that King Emanuel did fealty to the Pope on the occasion we are considering, and acknowledged *his* supremacy by whose grant he held his conquests. Nor is it wonderful, superseded as the Lord Jesus had long been, for the most part, by Rome and its Papal Antichrist, even in the world of thought and imagination, throughout Western Europe, that in this extension of the Papal dominion over so many newly-discovered countries, men should have fancied the incipient fulfilment of the Scripture prophecies referred to.² It was quite natural. We see exemplified in it the settled anti-christian spirit of the age.—Thus, reverting to the Florentine painting exhibited on the day of Pope Leo's enthronization, we have seen enough to convince us that, instead of its being an absurd or exaggerated device, it was only a graphic symbolization of a prerogative already exercised, as well as asserted, by the Popes. And in evidence of the strict chronological propriety both of it and of its Apocalyptic counterpart, we may note the fact that Pope Leo himself also now acted out what the painting symbolized. Pleased with the devotedness of the Portuguese king, he made a donation to him, in terms more ample than those of the original grant to Prince Henry, of all countries, provinces, and islands, which he might recover from the infidels, not only from Capes Bojador and Non to the Indies, but in the parts yet undiscovered and unknown even to the

¹ Edinb. Review, Vol. 42, p. 276. The fact is singular; the rather because the first English attempt at colonization was made under *Elizabeth*; by which Princess one might have supposed that the grant of the Bull would not be held very sacred.

² Seneca's lines were also referred to:

Venient annis
 Sacula seris, quibus Oceanus
 Vincula rerum laxet, et ingens
 Pateat tellus, Siphysque novos
 Detegat orbes, nec sit terris
 Ultima Thule.

Pontiff himself.¹ So did he plant one foot on the land, the other on the sea and the countries in it, even where the mists of distance and imperfect geographical knowledge might as yet hide them from view ; distributing them, as their undoubted and supreme lord, to whom he would. And both in doing so, and in accepting the appropriation to the Papacy of the latter day prophecies, —indeed himself in his medals appropriating them,²— he stood forth before Christendom, in all that concerned this world's dominion, as a daring and gigantic usurper of the rights of Christ.

3. Once more I have to exhibit, in the actual realities of life, that *voice* of the *Pope* in guise and character as a *Lion*, asserting the world as his prey, claiming to himself its government, and threatening wrath and destruction against opponents or rebels,³—to the which I invited attention in the *third* place, from among the devices in the Leonine pageant, as another of the almost counterpart paintings there exhibited, in honour of the usurping Antichrist, to that in the Apocalyptic vision of the true Christ now under consideration.—In order to this let us again direct the eye to Rome.—The solemn Council General of Christendom, as already hinted, is there at this very time holding its sessions.⁴ Where so likely a place in which to hear the voice of the Papal Lion ? The session is in the Lateran Church, the same that the Pope was enthroned in. There then let us enter, look, and listen. It is another of Papal Rome's chambers of imagery.

¹ Roscoe ii. 304.

² Bonanni gives a medal struck by Pope Leo soon after his accession, with his head on the *obverse*, the five balls, his heraldic insignia, on the *reverse*, and the *legend*, "Gloria et honore coronasti eum :"—a passage, as Bonanni observes, from the 8th Psalm, and prophetic of Messiah's ultimate universal empire on earth. Compare Heb. ii. 7, 8.

A medal with similar device and *legend* was struck by the French King, on Leo's accession, which is given in the lately published work on "*Glyptiques et Numismatiques*" by M. Achille Collas.—See too the one given by me p. 56 *suprà*.

³ See p. 56.

⁴ It was opened May 3, 1512, by Pope Julius II ; and, after twelve sessions terminated March 16, 1517.—Four General Councils had been previously held in the Lateran Church : viz. in the years 1123, 1139, 1179, and 1215 respectively.

And truly the scene is not a little imposing.—Has it fallen to the Reader's lot to visit the church they were assembled in? If so, as the mighty nave has opened to his view, and its lofty arches of polished marble stretched before him in long perspective, with the double Corinthian pilasters richly gilt, and sculptured forms of prophets and apostles, in triple elevation, supporting and dividing them,—as his eye has ranged down them to the canopied high altar at the transept, then glanced above and below at the decorated compartments of the roof and the pavement of marble and mosaic, then to the arches, columns, chapelries, and statuary of the double side-aisles grouping variedly in light and shadow,—a feeling of the grandeur and beauty of art in the structure may have stolen over him, detached him in thought from the tumult of living things, and prepared him for the deeper sympathies to be awakened by the soft or solemn music, of organ and of chant, soon swelling on the ear. All these seductions, we must remember, met the pilgrim visitant to the Lateran Church at the time we refer to; ¹ seductions whereby the Roman apostacy has ever sought to act upon the senses, and awaken in the soul that religious sentimentalism, which it is too often ready to accept, and satisfy itself with, in place of religion.²—Nor was there wanting to the local scene the solemn undefined charm of association with *antiquity*. A part the most ancient of the Church, as well as the Baptistry adjoining, recalled the name of the *great Constantine*, as its founder: ³ and so that high antiquity was

¹ The interior of the Lateran Church bore sufficient resemblance, at the time spoken of, to what it is now, to have produced much of the same effect. The *original* structure (on which see Note 1, p. 75.) having been nearly destroyed by a fire in 1308, it was very soon rebuilt, and much on the same ground plan &c. as still remains. The chief alterations subsequently made in the interior (i. e. between 1560 and 1730) consisted in the gilded ceiling added by Pius IV, and the change in the nave by Innocent X, who incorporated its ancient granite columns into the larger Corinthian pilasters. Besides which the exterior facade was added.

² The eloquence of Madame de Staël is vainly spent, in attempting to show identity between these two things that are so essentially different. See Corinne, Book x. Chap. iv, v, &c.

³ The Emperor Constantine, on his conversion, is said to have given to the Bishop of Rome first the Lateran Palace, and then the Lateran Church adjoining:

suggested, which, on them that were willing to forget *Jerusalem*, might be palmed as a sufficient reason for giving to it, at least in western Europe, the proud title of *mother*, as well as *mistress*, of all churches.

But on the occasion I am to speak of, it was not the mere architectural grandeur of the scene, and the remembrances of other far distant times associated with it, that constituted it so imposing. Behold gathered within its walls, and sitting all in ordered array, above 300 bishops and archbishops, arrived as representatives from England, from Spain, from Portugal, from the Germanic empire, from Savoy, and from the lesser states of Italy; together with Ambassadors, Generals of the religious orders, the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and not a few other ecclesiastics from beyond the seas:—the whole, under Pope Leo's presidency, constituting the Council General, as they say, or representative body of the *Church Universal*.¹ Considered in this light, where was ever assembly of pretensions more august?—The Bishops appear arrayed in their rich vestments of office, and with their jewelled mitres on the head.² The Pope too,—who

which latter, after building, he richly endowed for the support of *lamps* and *ministers*. So Anastasius the Librarian tells us, in his work on the Magnificence of Constantine; a writer of the 9th century.

Already in the 4th and 5th centuries it appears that this church was one of popular resort. Jerom in his *Epist.* 84 *De Morte Fabiolæ*, (written about A. D. 400,) speaking of her tells how in her widowhood, “*Ante diem Paschæ in Basilicâ quondam Laterani, qui Cæsariano truncatus est gladio, staret in ordine pœnitentium;*” &c. Again, writing against Symmachus, Prudentius has the line; *Cœtibus aut magnis Lateranas currit ad ædes.*

See Moreri, *Art. Lateran*; also Burton's *Rome*. And I suppose it is this that Pope Martin refers to in his Letter to Theodorus, as that in which he was seized by the soldiers of the Greek Emperor A. D. 650: “*in ecclesiâ quæ cognominatur Constantiniana; quæ prima in toto mundo constructa et stabilita est à beatæ memoriæ Constantino Imperatore, et est juxtâ episcopium.*” Harduin iii. 677.

¹ “*Universalem representantis ecclesiam:*” 8th Session. Harduin Concil. ix. 1715, &c.—Bossuet, and others of the Gallican Church, endeavoured subsequently to make out that this was not a Universal Council; the abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction which constituted, as we shall see, a most important part of its proceedings, having excited their aversion to it. But convened as it was in proper form, and, after the adhesion of the French king in the 8th Session, with all the states of Western Christendom as parties consenting and acting in it, the objection is evidently quite untenable.

² “*Intraverunt cardinales, patriarchæ, archiepiscopi, episcopi, abbates, &c., ornati pluvialibus, planetis, et dalmaticis, juxtâ ordinis qualitatem, et mitris, locum in medio Lateranensis ecclesiæ pro celebratione concilii hujusmodi paratum.*” So Harduin ix. 1574, of the 1st Session: adding also; “*cum suis sub-*

sits alone upon a throne high and lifted up, as becomes his dignity,—appears in the scarlet and gold of his pontificals; and bears on his head that pontifical mitre, whence he claims, as its appanage, universal empire.¹ And, let me ask, as he sits there, and receives the adoration of the assembly, and ascription to him, as we shall see presently, of the divine titles, offices, and functions, does it not seem the very fulfilment of that ancient prophecy which declared of Antichrist, that sitting in the temple of God he would show himself as God?² For should the words “temple of God,” be *literally* taken, as by some of the fathers, the Lateran Church, according to the ideas then received, was, as the mother, the representative, if I may so say, of all Christian Churches.³ And, if taken *figuratively*, which doubtless is the correcter view, and as symbolizing the living members of the professing Christian Church, it was before an assembly that represented the whole professing Church that he now thus showed himself.

The Council has been convened by the Papal Bull for the *extirpation* of the *schisms* and *heresies* that have divided the Church, its *union*, *reformation*, and *exaltation*.⁴ And this is the arrangement for its proceedings; that before it transact official business, and the Papal

sellis, tabulatis, clausuris, altaribus, Pontificali cathedrâ, ornamentis, et ordinibus, quæ in hujusmodi sacrorum conciliorum celebrationibus servari et fieri consuevisse reperiuntur.”

Compare the description in Harduin vii. 378, 687, of the arrangement and order observed, in the first and second General Councils at Lyons, held A. D. 1245, 1274.—On occasion of this Lateran Council sitting, it is said that the arrangements and order observed were the same as usual. Hard. ix. 1574.

¹ See Pope Innocent’s observation on the Papal mitre p. 50, Note 3 *suprà*.

² Compare the saying of *Gerbert* Archbishop of Rheims, (or perhaps of *Arnold* Bishop of Orleans) in the Synod of Rheims, A. D. 991. “What do you conceive this man, sitting on a lofty throne, glittering in purple and gold? If he be destitute of charity, and puffed up by knowledge alone, he is Antichrist sitting in the temple of God, and showing himself that he is God.” See Bishop Newton, p. 574, and Mr. Maitland’s Enquiry, p. 59. Mr. Maitland suggests that the then accused Bishop of Rheims, rather than the Pope, may have been meant. But did a Bishop glitter in *purple* as his distinctive?

³ See Vol. i. pp. 361, 362.

⁴ “Ad ecclesiæ exaltationem, unitatem, et reformationem; schismatum; et hæresum totalem extirpationem.” So in Pope Julius’ second Bull of Convocation. Harduin, ix. 1591. The Bull was issued by him “auctoritate Omnipotentis Dei, quâ in terris fungimur.” Ib. 1590.

Lion, who is using it as his instrument, speak his and its enactments, the mass be first celebrated, the litanies, Gospel, and hymn "Veni Creator Spiritus," chanted, and a sermon or oration, bearing on the business, pronounced by a selected member of the Council. Nor will it be well to pass to its enactments, in other words to the *voice of Leo*, which concluded its Sessions, without observing in the first instance the spirit and sentiments of this Council of the Christian Church, as exhibited in the orations of these its appointed preachers. It will be seen how they ascribe to the Pope the dignity, titles, and relations to the Church of the Lord Jesus,—just like the parties of whom I have before spoken; similarly make appeals to him, (founded on this his character of Vice-Christ) as the hope and Saviour of the Church; similarly express their expectation of the fulfilment in his person and reign of the latter-day prophecies, respecting the final blessedness, universality, and oneness of Christ's kingdom.—So, for example, in that of the 4th Session by the Venetian prelate Marcellus, Apostolic Prothonotary. After notice of the corruptions, divisions, and dangers of the Christian Church, he describes her as seeking refuge with the Roman Pontiff, and, prostrate at his most holy feet, thus addressing him: "I have compassed sea and land, and found none but thee to care for my preservation and dignity. Unhappy, degraded by wicked hands from my original high elevation, and with my heavenly beauty defiled by earthly pollutions, I come to thee as my true Lord and Husband; beseeching thee to look to it that thy bride be renewed in her beauty. And see too that the flock committed to thee be nourished with the best and spiritual aliment, the fold united in one which is now divided, and the sickness healed which has afflicted the whole world. For thou art our Shepherd, our Physician, in short a second God on the earth."¹ In similar strain, in the

¹ "Ad tuos sanctissimos devoluta pedes in hunc modum opem humiliter implorare videtur. Terras et maria circuivi, et nullum præter te, Pontifex beatissime, qui me magis diligeret, dignitatemque meam et salutem magis curaret,

6th Session, the Bishop of Modrusium, figuring the Holy Roman Church as the *heavenly Jerusalem*, and the *bride* of Christ, each a favourite emblem with the orators,¹ and after confessing the almost total extinction, at the time then being, of faith and piety in it,² thus proceeds to express himself. "Is this Jerusalem, that city of perfect beauty, the daughter of Zion, the spouse of Christ? But weep not, daughter of Zion; for God hath raised up a Saviour for thee. *The Lion of the tribe of Judah*, the root of David, hath come, and shall save thee from all thy enemies. On thee, O most blessed Leo, we have fixed our hopes as the promised Saviour."³ And then follows the supplication and appeal to him, in which other orators also unite that follow. "Vindi-

veni. Ad te igitur supplex, tanquam ad verum principem, protectorem, et sponsum, accedo.—Cura, Pater beatissime, ut sponsæ tuæ forma decorque redeat; &c. Cura ut salutem quam dedisti nobis, et vitam, et spiritum, non amittamus. Tu enim pastor, tu medicus, tu gubernator, tu denique alter *Deus* in terris." Hard. ib. col. 1651. The Pope is by others also addressed as the *sponsus* of the Church. So in Sess. vi. col. 1687; Sess. ix. col. 1765, "ego te ut ecclesiæ universæ præpositum sponsum amplector;" &c. (Compare the account of the Pope's marriage to it given p. 50 *suprà*.)—The first quotation, being in the 4th Session, was addressed to Leo's predecessor Julius II; and shows that it was to the Pope as Pope, not to the individual, that the blasphemous flatteries as to prerogative were applied; though it was on the individual Pope Leo X that the hopes rested as the fulfiller of the prophecies of the latter day.—Let the address "Tu alter *Deus*," &c, not be overlooked.

¹ The former specially in Cardinal Caietan's Sermon (Session 2,) on the text, "I saw that holy city the New Jerusalem descending out of heaven:" in which, considering the Church Catholic, with Rome as its head, as the Jerusalem intended, he illustrates the five points, viz. its being a city or state,—holy,—Jerusalem,—new,—heavenly; the *new* being explained by contrast with the Jewish Church, which was of the older dispensation:—also in the Sermon by the Archbishop of Patras in the 10th Session, on the text, "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the City of our God, &c, (Psalm xlv. 1,) from which extracts are given in some Notes following; and which distinctly refers the *heavenly state* of the New Jerusalem to the *reformed state* of the Roman Church, now about to be accomplished. Hard. 1618, 1786. The Cardinal Caietan of the 2nd Session, was the same De Vio that became so well known afterwards, from his conference as Papal Legate with Luther.

I beg the reader to refer to my observations Vol. i. p. 238, on the earliest transfer to the Church earthly and visible of the scripture language and promises respecting the Church invisible and spiritual. It is a point very important.

² "Tædet vero pigetque fidem, pietatem, religionem, nostris temporibus ita tepuisse, et pæne dixerim contabuisse videri, ut vix earum ulla vestigia sint reliqua." Hard. 1686.

³ "Ne fleveris, filia Sion: quia ecce venit Leo de tribu Juda, radix David: suscitavit tibi Deus Salvatorem. Te, Leo Beatissime, Salvatore venturum speravimus." 1687. The Saviour *that was to come*: *τον ερχομενον*. The language is indeed strange; but the allusion cannot be mistaken. Compare Matt. xi. 3, Heb. x. 37, Apoc. i. 4, &c.

cate the tent of thy spouse, that has been violated by the wicked ! Purify what is polluted in the Church ! Amend what is wrong ! Against the infidels, (i. e. against the Turks,) gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O thou most mighty !¹ Then by the fire and burning of the pastor's office, extinguish schism and heresy !² That so, the great and ultimate reform and renovation having been accomplished in the Church,³ and the world brought into the true faith,—religion, justice, and piety may flourish, the golden age revive, thine inheritance be restored to thee,⁴ the Church escape from the great tribulation, the promised sabbatism begin,—all which, from the computation of times, seems close at hand ;—and those prophecies, so perpetually of late the theme of conversation,⁵ be fulfilled ; “ Thou shalt rule from sea to sea, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd ; ”—“ I saw the New Jerusalem come down out of heaven prepared as a bride for her husband ; ”—and again, “ It shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and all nations flow to it : ”—there being meant by the mountain of the Lord's house the plenitude

¹ This expression is from the oration in the 7th Session : in which various similar profane applications of texts belonging to Christ occur : for example, “ I, if I be lifted up, shall draw all men unto me ; ” which is applied to the effects of Leo's assumption to the Popedom. Again ; “ Of them that thou hast given me, have I lost none. ” Hard. cols. 1704, 1705.

² “ Serpentem vero sævissimi schismatis hydram caritatis igne, et pastoralis officii adustione, extingue. ” The burning, in the pastoral office and character, illustrates, and is illustrated by, the painting of the shepherd fishing and casting the bad fish into the fire ; p. 54.—The Bohemian heretics, including the king as suspected, are specially noted in this same oration : “ accedente ad hoc Bohemorum regis perfidi, et in apertamjam hæresim prolabantis, sceleratæque et urbi vicina opinione. ” Hard. cols. 1685—1687.

³ “ Convenerunt in hoc sacrosancto Lateranensi Concilio ad reformationem tum ecclesiæ, tum orbis universi, pro gloriâ regni Christi, et suæ sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ et Apostolicæ sedis exaltatione ; quæ de proximo, juxta temporum computationem, pro secundâ sabbati fieri debet in magnâ et ultimâ reformatione, ” &c. Sess. x. Hard. col. 1786. The *secunda sabbati* is enlarged on as the sabbatism of the latter day. (Ducange, on the word *Sabbatum*, notes the phrase, but overlooks this use of it.)—So too the palm-bearing vision of Apoc. vii, in Sess. ix.

⁴ This last clause is from the conclusion of the oration of the 4th Session : “ Ita namque restituetur tibi hæreditas tua ; redibunt aurea secula ; tuoque flante Spiritu effluent aquæ, et irroratione tuâ terra pinguescet. ” The reader will mark how expressly it makes the Pope *heir of the world*, in place of Christ ; and also its blasphemous ascription to him of sending forth the *divine Spirit* as his own. Ibid. 1651.

⁵ “ Toties repetita his diebus. ”

of the power of his anointed one, his Christ, *in the Apostolic See.*"¹

Such, we see, is the appeal in these orations to the Leo, the Papal Lion of Rome; such the titles and offices, prophecies and hopes, attached to him and his Pontificate. And now hearken to the *lion's voice*, of which we were inquiring, as in answer. Accepting the deification, and the ascription to him of every title and office of Christ, as that which was indeed but his due,² his *first* and preliminary act, in assertion of that sovereignty over the world, and fulfilment of that office of its administration, which thus in the Council, as in the painting,³ had been assigned him,—is the citation of the adherents of the Pisan Council and Pragmatic sanction, as schismatics and rebels.⁴ And behold, at the very threatening of

¹ This last quotation is from the Sermon of the Archbishop of Patras in the 10th Session: "Sed ubi laudabitur? Dicat Propheta: *in civitate Dei*; in sanctâ utique immaculatâ ecclesiâ Dei, et, quod fortius et dignius est, in monte sancto Apostolicæ sedis ejus: de quo Isaias, Et erit in novissimis diebus mons preparatus in domo Domini super verticem omnium montium; qui est potestas plenitudinis *Christi ejus* in sede Apostolicâ." Hard. col. 1786.—He notices the number X attached to Leo's title, as suiting the conclusion and winding up of the dispensation. "Hoc tempore magnæ reformationis te canonicè electum existimo, ut sis Leo in sede Petri, *non ab re decimus*, pro Christi regno nostro tempore, si volueris, toto orbe terrarum innovando assumptus." Ib. 1784.

² It is to be remembered that the acts of the Council, including the orations, were published with his approbation and sanction.—"If," says Mr. Maitland, (Answer to Cuninghame, p. 42), "the Pope accepted and approved them, (viz. blasphemous appellations, as that of *God*) he was guilty;" i. e. of *blasphemy*. Such was now notably the case. See the examples, pp. 78, 62, &c.—His acceptance of them was the more marked, because the authentic copy of the Acts of the Council, including the orations or sermons delivered in it, was revised carefully under his direction, and published with the sanction of his hand and Preface. See Hard. ix. 1562, 1563.

³ "Præda digna meæ gloriæ!"—"Mihi curæ est."

⁴ "Pragmatic sanction was a general term for all important ordinances of church or state; those perhaps more properly which were enacted in public assemblies with the counsel of eminent *jurisconsults*, or *Pragmatici*." Waddington, p. 576.—That to which the title attached by way of eminence, and which is referred to continually in the history of the papal negotiations with France for the last half of the fifteenth century, as well as in the proceedings of this Lateran Council, was passed in the Council of *Bourges*, A. D. 1438;—a Council of the Gallican church, but attended by a papal legate, and one too from the Council General of *Basle*, which was then sitting. By it the Pope was declared, 1st. to have no authority in France over *temporals*, whereby the clergy were relieved from pecuniary contributions continually exacted by the Popes, more especially the *annates* or first year's produce of benefices; and 2ndly, in *spirituals*, though sovereign lord (suzerain), yet to be restricted and controlled by the canons and regulations of the ancient Councils. 3rdly, The authority of the General Council of *Basle* was recognized in it; and so the great principle of

his voice, both the schismatic cardinals, and the French king, hasten in public humiliation to renounce alike the one and the other, and to ask for absolution. On which, (according to the legend, “*Prostratis placidus,*” “*Supplices generosè exaudio,*”) the absolution is granted; ¹ and, in the confessed subjection of all the kingdoms of Western Christendom to the Papal supremacy, the schism healed.—*Then* against the *Bohemian heretics*, the only ones apparently known of as remaining, a citation is issued, with similar promise of consideration and clemency in case of submission.²—And when, as was avowed in triumphal tone by the preacher in the Session following, no heretic, or maintainer of his own private opinion against the Pope’s,³ was any more forthcoming, but all hushed in submission,—(“*Jam nemo reclamat, nullus obsistit,*”)⁴—*then*, and with a view to prevent any fresh rising of heresy or schism, and so to ensure the continued unity of his *bride* the church,⁵ without spot or wrinkle,⁶ in continued subjection to himself,—the Papal Lion thus again from the height of his apostolic office, as from the top of Mount Zion,⁷ issues his voice of command :—1st, that forasmuch as *printing*, that wonderful recently invented art, might be used to disseminate heretical notions, no books be *printed* without the previous

both it, and of the Council of Constance before it, that the Pope was subordinate to a General Council.

The Bull of Leo which assailed this Pragmatic Sanction as unlawful and schismatic, and disparaged also the Councils (*conciliabula*) of Bourges and Basle, was followed by a Concordat between the Pope and the King of France, Francis I; in which the Pope’s *temporal* jurisdiction over the Gallican church was allowed, and the *annates* not tacitly (as Dean Waddington says by mistake, p. 663.) but expressly restored to him. Tit. xliii, Hard. ix. 1886, and 1818.—This Concordat continued in force, till the new arrangement brought about by Bossuet in 1682.

¹ See the account in Roscoe ii. 231—236. Also the notice of it in a letter from the Cardinal Bembo to the emperor Maximilian; Ib. App. lxxxv.

² Of this more in a subsequent chapter on the death of the Witnesses.—It was in the eighth session.

³ “*In hanc in-pipientiam cadunt (sc. hæresis) quicumque ad cognoscendam veritatem aliquo impediuntur obscuro; et non ad propheticas voces, Apostolicas literas, evangelicas auctoritates, sed semetipsos recurrunt.*” Oration of Bernard Zane, Sess. I. Hard. col. 1604.

⁴ Hard. col. 1763.

⁵ “*Ecclesia sponsa nostra.*” Ib. 1810, 1830.

⁶ “*in unione sine rugâ et maculâ.*” Ib. 1810.

⁷ In the introduction of his Bull of the ninth session, Leo speaks of looking to the fulfilment of his charge over the universal church, “*ex summo apostolatûs apice, tanquam ex vertice Montis Sion.*” Hard. 1742.

censorship of the Pope's inquisitor in the district: ¹—2nd, that no *preaching* be allowed, or explanation of the Scriptures, except in conformity with that of the recognized fathers and doctors of the church,² and no mention moreover made by them of *Antichrist*, or speculations mooted as to the time (since it was altogether hidden from man) of the final predicted judgment: ³—3rdly, that the inquisitors fail not to exercise their vigilance, and proceed with all zeal against *heretics*, if afresh arising, in order to their utter elimination from the congregation of the faithful.⁴—So much for the preservation of the *unity* of the church.—As to its *reformation*,—that for which so many cries had arisen for centuries, so many efforts been made, and hopes now expressed of there

¹ This was in the tenth session, Hard. 1780. In the Bull the complaint is noticed as prevalent, "quòd nonnulli artis imprimendi magistri, in diversis mundi partibus, libros tam Græcæ, Arabicæ, et Chaldææ linguarum in Latinum translatos, quàm alios Latino ac vulgari sermone editos, errores etiam in fide, ac perniciosà dogmata religioni christianæ contraria, imprimere ac publicè vendere præsumunt;" and that hence arose a necessity for the papal censorship of the press.—It was not the first papal enactment of the kind. Within the forty years preceding, Sixtus IV and Alexander VI had anticipated Leo in it. But I presume it was considered more stringent than former ones; being singled out for approbation subsequently by the council of Trent.

The specification, among what were objectionable, of translations from the *Hebrew* and the *Greek* into the vulgar tongues, recalls to our minds the old *anti-biblical* edict of Pope Alexander V. still unrepealed, and now resanctioned. See p. 20 Note 1, *suprà*.

Roscoe (ii. 291) suggests that this act should be regarded as rather originating from the Council than from Leo of his own accord. This does not affect our view of it. It was the policy of Rome.

Further, he suggests Leo's encouragement of *Biblical* as of oriental literature generally, exemplifying in Cardinal Ximenes' famous Polyglot, or rather Triglot, published under Leo's sanction, and dedicated to him. But this was quite consistent with the policy of shutting out the Bible from the common people. The Triglot was in the learned languages, Hebrew, Greek, Latin. Indeed Cardinal Ximenes, in his preface, declares that it ought to be confined to those three, as the three in which the inscription on the cross was written. Let me add, that having placed the Latin in the middle column, the Hebrew and Septuagint Greek on the sides, he speaks of the latter two as representing respectively the Jewish Synagogue and Eastern or Greek church, which, like the two thieves, were the one on the right the other on the left, while Jesus, that is the Roman church, represented by the Vulgate, was in the middle! M'Crie's Reform. in Spain, 69—72.

² "Mandantes omnibus qui hoc onus (prædicandi) sustinent, ut evangelicam veritatem, et sanctam scripturam, juxta interpretationem doctorum quos ecclesia vel usus diuturnus approbavit, prædicent et explanent." Hard. 1808.

³ "Tempus quoque præfixum futurorum malorum, vel Antichristi adventum, aut certum diem judicii, prædicare vel asserere nequaquam præsumant." This, as well as the enactment previous, was in the 11th session. Hard. 1808.

⁴ "Ut omnes ficti Christiani, ac de fide male sentientes, cujuscumque generis aut nationis fuerint, necnon hæretici, seu aliquâ hæresis labe polluti, à Christi fidelium cœtu penitus eliminentur." Sess. ix; ib. col. 1757.

being at length the grand and final one,—he undertakes it as that which, like the rest, belonged to his province as supreme administrator: (“*mibi curæ est:*”) and accordingly issues enactments limiting pluralities, and forbidding a few other external abuses; but passes over, as needing no reform, and so adopts, and covers with the broad arrow of the Papal sanction, the whole doctrinal system of the apostacy, its *dæmonolatry*, sorceries, and religious thefts and murders.¹—Finally, in order to the effecting of the last and chief object of the Council, the *exaltation* of the Church, i. e. of the Church of *Rome*, he solemnly repeats and confirms the famous Bull “*Unam sanctam*,” of Pope Boniface the VIIIth; in which Bull the unity of the church is defined as that of one body under one head, the Roman Pontiff, Christ’s representative; and of which this is the conclusion, “We declare, define, and pronounce, that it is essential to the salvation of every human being that he be subject to the Roman Pontiff:”² prefixing thereto the declaration, “Whosoever obeys not, as the Scripture declares, let him die the death!”³

Such is the voice of the Pope, the “*Leo Papa*,”⁴ as of a lion roaring: and the whole christian Church, by its representatives in Council, assents and consents to it.⁵—On which, each object of its assembling having, as they view it, been accomplished, the Roman church by the Council’s reforming canons been renovated as the heavenly Jerusalem, by the extinction of heresies and schisms made one, and by the universal subjection of secular

¹ There is one true doctrine asserted, it may be said, viz. the immortality of the soul; and a wholesome canon passed in the condemnation of philosophers, who (whether as disciples of Averroes, or others) denied it. But let it be remembered that this was an error which, if admitted into the popular creed, would have destroyed not only religion but *Romanism*: for it would have done away with *purgatory* and *hell*; and so with the whole system of the established priestcraft.

² Hard. ix. 1830. See on this Bull, Waddington, 437.

³ “*Quibus* (i. e. *Vicariis Petri*) *ex Libri Regum testimonio ita obedire necesse est, ut qui non obedierit morte moriatur.*” This is at the head of the same Bull for the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction. Hard. ix. 1826.

⁴ “*Leo Episcopus, servus servorum Dei*,” stands at the head of all the decrees. They are drawn up too in the first person plural as *his* decrees; note being subjoined at the end of the assent of the Council.

⁵ There were now and then a few that individually expressed disagreement. But the number was very small;—from 1 to 5, 10, and once 19.

princes elevated as mount Zion on the top of the mountains, a Te Deum of thanksgiving is chanted, and the Council concludes: and, in order to the increase of the joy of its members at this its auspicious ending, a plenary remission of sins and indulgence is granted to each one of them by the Pope, once in life, and in the article of death.¹

Thus have I shewn the realization, or acting out in real life, by the Roman Bishop Leo X, of those prerogatives and functions of Christ, which were attributed to him in the three remarkable paintings to which I called attention, as exhibited before Christendom in the pageant of his enthronization. And now at length we are prepared to revert with abundant advantage to the *Apocalyptic vision* of the Covenant-Angel's descent, and the glorious events that it presignified.

For so it was, that just when the Roman ANTICHRIST seemed to have completed his triumph, and when,—not only without opposition in Christendom, but with Christendom consenting, applauding, admiring, and in the Papal exaltation and reign anticipating the fulfilment of Christ's promised reign with his saints,—this Usurper acted out the character of Christ, and exercised, or professed to exercise, in regard to both worlds, Christ's own god-like functions and prerogatives;—

Just when especially,—as if himself the heaven-sent one, mighty to save,—he made pretence of opening heaven to each believer in his magic charms, however laden he might be with guilt and sin, and exhibited himself to them as the dispenser of the mercies of the covenant, the Fountain of grace, the Saviour, the Justifier, the Sun of Righteousness;—

Just when, as if the appointed heir of the world, and

¹ “ Et ut ad propria aliquibus spiritualibus muneribus relecti cumulationi gaudio remeare possint, illis eorumque familiaribus plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum remissionem et indulgentiam, semel in vitæ et in mortis articulo, elargimur ” Hard. p. 1851.

who was to have all things put under his feet,—he claimed as his own the kingdoms of the earth, (not those of the Roman earth only, but those too in the mighty seas beyond it,) and, receiving homage for each grant from the princes of the world, enfeoffed them as sovereign lord to whom he would ;—

Just when,—after, assuming Christ's title of *lion*, agreeably with the old patristic anticipations respecting Antichrist,¹ even as if the lion of the tribe of Judah,—he had begun by acts and mandates, framed with a view to secure the church and world in subjection to him, to roar as it were over his prey, and threaten every opposer ;—

Just when, on the day of his enthronization, as on a day of high festival, there were exhibited amidst the applause of congregated Christendom, paintings on which art seemed to have lavished all its ingenuity of decoration, and which, as the devices that might best symbolize these his threefold prerogatives and functions as Christ's vicar and impersonator, represented this same usurping Antichrist, in one part as beaming like the new-risen *sun* from heaven upon earth, together with a *rainbow* to reflect his brightness,—in another as *placing one foot on the land and the other on the sea*,—in a third as looking and roaring, with the world in his clutch, as *when a lion roareth* on his prey ;—

Just at this very time it was that there occurred the fulfilment of another symbolic figuration, devised by higher than human art, and evidently in purposed contrast to the former, though framed above 1400 years before it :—a figuration which, in the visions of Patmos, foreshowed CHRIST to St. John as now at length intervening, after

¹ "As then the *Lord Jesus Christ*, for the royal and glorious principle of his nature, was beforehand preached of as a *lion*, in the same manner have the Scriptures spoken beforehand of the *Antichrist* also as a *lion*, for his tyrannical and violent nature. For the deceiver wishes to liken himself in respect of all things to the Son of God. The Christ is a lion, and the Antichrist is a lion. The Christ is a king, and the Antichrist is a king." So *Hippolytus*, De Antichristo ; quoted by Greswell, Vol. i. p. 376.—He adds : "The Saviour was manifested as a *lamb*, and he likewise shall appear as a *lamb*, being within a *wolf*, &c." And it is observable that De Pennis in his Tract, when describing Pope Leo's progress, unites the comparison both to the lion and the lamb. "Il nostro Leone assai piu umile ed immacolato che il puro agnello."

long forbearance, in vindication of his own rights, truth, and people,—revealing *Himself* as the true covenant-Angel from heaven, with *his* face shining as the sun, and a rainbow about *his* head,—planting moreover *his* right foot on the sea, *his* left on the land,—and crying with a loud voice, as when a *lion* roareth. “Like as a lion roaring on his prey, when a multitude of shepherds is called forth against him, he will not be afraid of their voice, nor abase himself for the noise of them,” so was the Lord represented as now “coming down to fight for Mount Zion,”¹—against Antichrist and Antichrist’s assembled Council.

And whereas the Papal lion’s voice, in vindication of his usurping claims on the church and world, and to counteract all opposition, enacted decrees, as we have seen, preventive of the *printing* of all books on religion except as approved by him, and especially of God’s book the Bible,—preventive also of all *preaching* except in accordance with the established Roman interpretations of Scripture,—and further enjoining that there should be no mention by them of the *coming of Antichrist*, or of the time of the great final judgment ;

So in the apocalyptic vision there was prefigured, as what would take place at the same precise epoch, Christ’s own opening to the world of that forbidden book of God,—his revival of that forbidden Gospel-preaching,—his exposure of Antichrist, as even then alive in the *Popes*,—and revelation too (so far as man might know it,) of the time of the fated judgment, as involving the Popedom’s destruction, and placed at but one Trumpet’s interval from the chronological epoch of the intervention here symbolized.—All these things, I say, were foreshadowed in the vision before us ; and in the Protestant Reformation all these things, as we shall see, were done.

Finally, as the Papal lion spoke enactments in its roaring with a view to *eliminate*, and cast out of the company of the faithful, all *heretics*, or those that dissented

¹ Isa. xxxi. 4.

from the Roman apostacy and Roman Antichrist,—so there was prefigured in the apocalyptic vision a solemn elimination and casting out from Christ’s true church, and the communion of the faithful, of Rome, its Bishop, ministers, and Church, as apostate and antichristian.—This also had its fulfilment in the same great event ; and, together with a certain political revolution accompanying,—the fall of a tenth part of the mystic Babylon, precluding its entire fall,—appeared both in the prophecy and in the history as what may be called the completing act of the Reformation.

To show this, we must now pass on to that memorable history. With the Apocalyptic vision before us as our guide, we shall find ourselves called to notice, just in this very order, *the commencement, progress, and each grand epoch* of the great and glorious Reformation of the xvith century.

CHAPTER IV.

COMMENCEMENT OF THE REFORMATION, IN THE
DISCOVERY FIRST OF CHRIST THE SAVIOUR,
THEN OF ANTICHRIST THE USURPER.
APOC. X. 1—5.

It is the *origin and commencement* of the blessed REFORMATION that is now our subject. And how can we so well set it forth, or how so well expound the Apocalyptic vision which prefigured it, as by tracing its development in the *mind and history* of LUTHER ? In no case, perhaps, is the principle of studying history in biography applied with such advantage as in this. Luther was both the master-spirit of that great revolution of the xvith century, and the type, in the inward experience of soul that made him a reformer, of what afterwards influenced the soul of many another. “ The Reformation passed,” it has been said by a learned Professor of Mo-

dern History, “ from the mind of Luther into the mind of Western Europe : ”¹ and by M. Merle D’Aubigné, more in particular ; “ The *different phases* of the Reformation succeeded each other in the soul of Luther, its instrumental originator, before its accomplishment in the world.”²

Of these phases the *two first*, and those from which the rest proceeded, are figured to us, as distinctly as beautifully, in that portion of the Apocalyptic vision (already in part discussed) that stands referred to at the head of this chapter. Let us consider the two separately. They will exhibit to us the *secret origin*, the *first public acts*, and so the *opening epoch* of the Reformation.

§ 1.—THE DISCOVERY OF CHRIST THE SAVIOUR.

“ And I saw a mighty Angel coming down from heaven, clothed with a cloud : and the rainbow was upon his head ; and his face was as the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire : and He had in his hand a little book opened. And He set his right foot upon the sea, and his left upon the land ; and cried with a loud voice, as when a lion roareth.” Apoc. x. 1—3.

It was LUTHER, we said, that was God’s chosen instrument to effect this great revolution :—Luther, the son of a poor miner at Mansfeld ;³ one who when at school in his early boyhood, both at Magdeburgh and

¹ Smythe, Lectures on Modern History, i. 265. He observes at the same time ; “ Milner’s is the best account of the more intellectual part of the History of the Reformation ; in other words, of the progress of the Reformation in Luther’s own mind ;—a very interesting subject.” In M. Merle D’Aubigne’s lately published History, we have a development of the same subject still more full and still more interesting.

² Merle D’Aub. i. 130.

³ The following chronological epochs occur in Luther’s early life. He was born A. D. 1483 ; entered the University of Erfurt, 1501, the Augustin monastery 1505 ; was called to Wittenberg 1508, or 1509 ; in 1510 visited Italy and Rome ; in 1512 was made Doctor of Divinity ad Biblia ; in 1517 posted up his Theses against Indulgences, and so began the Reformation.

then at Eisnach, had to beg his bread under the pinchings of want, with the pitiful cry of "Bread for the love of God;"¹ and was indebted to the charity of a burgher's wife in Eisnach, afterwards spoken of as the pious Shunamite, for the power of pursuing his studies, and almost for his preservation. "Not many mighty, not many noble: but God hath chosen the weak things of the world, to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen; that no flesh should glory in his presence."²

Let us hasten to that crisis of his history to which our subject directs us; that wherein he was prepared for, and then began to act out, the great part assigned him in the reformation and revivification of Christ's fallen church.

He had grown at this time into manhood; and having passed from the schools to the University of Erfurt, had there, in the course of the usual four years of study, displayed intellectual powers and an extent of learning, that excited the admiration of the University, and seemed to open to his attainment both the honors and the emoluments of the world; when behold, on a sudden, to the dismay as well as astonishment of his friends, he renounced the world and all its brilliant prospects, and betook himself to the solitude and gloom of an Augustine monastery.³—Wherefore so strange a step?—We find that thoughts deeper and mightier than those that agitate the surface of a vain world were then pressing on his soul; the thoughts of death, judgment, eternity, God Almighty!—There had combined together different causes to induce this state of mind. He had found a

¹ "Panem propter Deum!" Michelet i. 4.

² 1 Cor. i. 26, 27. The *Italics* that close the English authorized Translation of verse 26,—"*Not many mighty are called,*" are evidently incorrect. The apostle is speaking of the persons made use of by God in *the Christian ministry*, for the *calling* of men to the knowledge of Himself, not of the *converts called*.

³ The following abstract of Luther's early history is taken chiefly from M. Merle D'Aubigné. With this both Milner and Michelet agree in main things. Indeed all the three histories are drawn from materials of Luther's own furnishing; so as to be alike a kind of auto-biography.

*Bible.*¹ It was a copy of the Vulgate, hid in the shelves of the University Library. Till then he had supposed that there existed no other gospels or epistles than what were given in the Breviary or by the Preachers.² The discovery amazed him. He was at once rivetted by what he read therein. It increased, even to intensesness, the

¹ He tells us expressly that it was when *he was 20 years old*, and consequently in 1503, after he had been two out his four years at the Erfurt University, that he first discovered this copy of the Bible. So Merle D'Aub. i. 143.—Seckendorf, p. 19, and after him Milner, (p. 667, Ed. in one Vol. 1838) have made a mistake in supposing that it was in the *Monastery of Erfurt* that he first found the copy.

² Mr. Maitland, in his "Dark Ages," (p. 468) has somewhat scornfully expressed his disbelief of this statement, as given by M. Merle ubi suprâ; declaring it incredible that Luther should not have known more of the Bible, after his University course of study. In reply, M. Merle, in a letter published in the Record of Dec. 12, 1844, cites *Mathesius* and also *Melchior Adam*, in proof of the correctness of his statement. And their testimonies are decisive as to the fact. To which I beg to add *Luther's own*, given by Michelet, (i. 292) from the *Tischreden*, or *Table-talk*; "J'avais vingt ans que je n'avois pas encore vu de Bible. Je croyois qu'il n'existait d'autres evangiles ni epîtres que celles des sermonaires."

With regard to the general ignorance of the Bible among the *laity*, notwithstanding the many editions of the *Latin Bible* and some German versions printed in the half-century preceding, spoken of by Mr. Maitland, M. Merle cites a passage from Trithemius, the learned Abbot of Spanheim, who lived till the Reformation; speaking in strong terms of the general ignorance of the Holy Scriptures, on the part even of priests and prelates.—Even now, as Sign. Ciocci informs us, (Narrative, p. 66) the same ignorance of the Scriptures exists still among *University students*, at Rome itself. "At the age of eighteen," he says, and I have myself heard him repeat the statement, "I had never read the Bible, except in small portions inserted in the Breviary, or sung during mass."—"Who now reads the Bible," said the Librarian Alberico to him: "it is a Book almost disused."

As to the German versions previously published, Michelet observes of them from Seckendorf, that they were neither suited for, nor allowed to the *people*; "*Nec legi permittebantur, nec ob styli et typorum horriditatem satisfacere poterant.*" And he adds the following statements for *Luther*. "Sous la Papauté la Bible étoit inconnue aux gens. Carlostadt commença à la lire lorsqu'il étoit déjà Docteur depuis huit ans.—Le Docteur Usingen, moine Augustin, qui fut mon precepteur au convent d'Erfurd, me disait, quand il me voyait lire la Bible avec tant d'ardeur; Ah, frère Martin, qu'est ce que la Bible? On doit lire les anciens docteurs, qui du ont sucé le miel de la vérité: la Bible est la cause de tous les troubles." Tischreden 6, 7.—In illustration of the general ignorance of the Bible among Papists, even some years later, Michelet gives the two following anecdotes. "A la diète d'Augsburg (1530) l'Éveque de Mayence jeta un jour les yeux sur une Bible. Survint par hasard un de ses conseillers qui lui dit, "Gracieux Seigneur, que fait de ce livre votre Grace Electorale? A quoi il repondit, Je ne sais quel livre c'est: seulement tout ce que j'y trouve est contre nous." This is from *Luther's Tischreden*.—The other is from Sismondi's *Hist. de France*: "En 1530 un moine Français disait en chaire; On a trouvé une nouvelle langue que l'on appelle Grecque: il faut s'en garantir avec soin. Cette langue enfante toutes les heresies. Je vois dans les mains d'un grand nombre de personnes un livre écrit en cette langue. On le nomme Nouveau Testament: c'est un livre plein de ronces et de vipères."

Finally let me add Pellicanus' statement, that just before the Reformation a *Greek Testament* could not be procured at any price in all Germany. Milner, p. 661.

desire already awakened in his heart to know God. At the same time there was that in its descriptions of man's sinfulness, and God's holiness and wrath against sin, which awed and alarmed him.—*Providential occurrences*, following soon after, confirmed and deepened the work on his conscience. He was brought by a dangerous illness into the near view of death. He saw a beloved friend and fellow-student suddenly cut off with scarce a moment's warning. He was overtaken while journeying by a lightning-storm, terrific to him, from his associating it with an angry God, as the lightnings of Sinai to Israel. He felt unprepared to meet Him. How shall I stand justified before God? This was now the absorbing thought with him. Thenceforth the world, its riches and its honors, were to him as nothing. What would he profit, were he to gain the whole world and lose his own soul?—In the pursuit, however, of this great object, no success seemed to attend him. He longed to know God; but neither his own understanding, nor the philosophy and learning of the University, yielded him the light he needed for it. He longed to propitiate Him: but his conscience itself was dissatisfied with the inadequacy of his performances. It was the long established notion among the more serious that the *convent* was the *place*, and its *prayers*, *penances*, and *mortifications* the *means*, whereby most surely to attain to the knowledge and favour of God. There, then, he determined to pursue his absorbing object. He gathered his friends around him; ate his farewell meal with them; then sought the monastery. Its gate opened and closed on him. He had become an Augustinian Monk.

But was his object attained? Did he find the holiness, or the peace with God, that he longed for? Alas, no! In vain he practised all the strictest rules of the monkish life. In vain he gave himself, night and day, to the repetition of prayers, penances, fastings, and every kind of self-mortification. He found that in changing his dress he had not changed his heart. The consciousness of sin remained with him;—of its indwel-

ling power, its guilt, its danger. “O, my sin! my sin!” was the exclamation heard at times to burst from him.¹ Pale, emaciated, behold him moving along the corridors like a shadow! Behold him on one occasion fallen down in his cell, and, when found, lying in appearance dead; from the exhaustion of the mental conflict, yet more than of sleeplessness and fasting.² He is a wonder to all in the convent. A wounded spirit who can bear?

There was a copy of the Vulgate chained in the monastery. With eagerness still undiminished he renewed his intense study of it. But it gave him, no more than before, the consolation that he sought for. Rather those awful attributes of God, his justice and holiness, appeared to him, as there represented, more terrible than ever. Above all for this reason, because even in the *Gospel*, (that which professed to be the Gospel of *mercy* to fallen man,) there seemed to be intimated a fresh exercise and manifestation of God’s *justice*: according to the express saying of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, “*Justitia Dei revelatur in eo;*”—“The justice of God is revealed in it.” Was it not adding grief to grief, to make even the *Gospel* an occasion for threatening mankind with God’s justice and wrath?³

It was at this time that Staupitz, Vicar-general of the Augustins, was sent by God as his messenger, to assist in shedding light on the darkness of this wounded soul, and opening to him the Scriptures. On his visitation of the convent at Erfurt he at once distinguished from among the rest the young monk of Mansfeld. He beheld him with his eyes sunk in their sockets, his countenance stamped with melancholy, his body emaciated by study, watchings, and fastings, so that they might have counted his bones.⁴ It needed not an interpreter to tell him what was pressing on that sorrowful soul. For Staupitz was one who, in secret and unknown to the

¹ Michelet i. 9.

² Merle D’Aub. i. 160.

³ Michelet i. 11. The Vulgate reads, “*Justitia Dei revelatur in illo:*” scil. *evangelio*. This made Luther’s mistake the more natural.

⁴ Merle d’Aub. i. 163.

world, had gone through somewhat of the same conflicts as Luther; until in the Gospel, rightly understood, he found a Saviour. In the experience of his own heart he had both a key to understand, and a spring of sympathy to feel for, what was passing in Luther's. He sought and gained his confidence. He entered with him on the solemn subjects of his anxiety. The Bible lay opened before them.¹ He expounded from it to the poor trembler God's love and mercy to man, as exhibited in *Christ crucified*. He spoke of his *death* as the expiation for penitent sinners; his *righteousness* and perfect *justice of life* as their plea, their trust. These were views as comforting as new to Luther. He began to see that the justice, of which St. Paul spoke as manifested in the Gospel, was not the *active vindictive* justice that he had supposed, but *passive* justice, as the schoolmen might say, *inherent righteousness*; ² that which, being the characteristic in perfection of the life of the LORD JESUS, was accepted by God *vicariously*, (being in *this* sense called "God's righteousness,") in place of the imperfect and defiled performance of penitent sinners; just as his death was also vicarious, and expiatory of the guilt of their sins. O godlike scheme for saving sinners! O how unlike that of the convent and the schools, which through penances and works of merit directed men to accomplish their salvation! ³—When Luther still objected his *sinfulness*, it was answered by Staupitz, "Would you have merely the semblance of a sinner, and the semblance of a Saviour?" ⁴ And when he objected again that it was *penitent* sinners only that Christ's salvation belonged, and that how to obtain the true spirit of penitence,—that which included, as he had learnt from the Bible, the love of holiness and love of God, and which with all his self-mortifications and penitential observances he had sought in vain,—it was answered by the Vicar-general; "It is from the *love of God* that true repentance

¹ Mich. i. 292.² Ib. p. 12.³ Popery, says Luther in his Commentary on Genesis, never spoke of the *promises* in Scripture.⁴ Merle, i. 166.

has alone its origin. Seek it not in these macerations and mortifications of the body! Seek it in contemplating God's love in Christ Jesus! Love Him who has thus first loved you!"¹

He heard the words; he received them: received them not as the voice of his Vicar-general, but as the voice of the Divine Spirit speaking by him. It was the opening to him of the Gospel; the setting forth to him of the two things he had been so intently seeking, and which he now saw to be clearly expressed in the Gospel-record, the principle of *justification before God*, and the principle of godly *penitence* and *sanctification* within. O how did the glory of JEHOVAH-JESUS, even of Him that furnishes both to the believing penitent, begin now to shine before him! Was it not just as in the *emblems* of the *Apocalyptic vision* under consideration? With the eye of faith he beheld Him beaming upon this lost world,—yea, and upon his own lost soul,—as the *Sun of Righteousness*: and the dark thunder-clouds of the mental storm that had past over him only served to throw out more strikingly the beauty of the *rainbow* of covenant-mercy,²—that characteristic and constant accompaniment of the Sun of Righteousness when shining on a penitent,—as reflected from them. "He beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the

¹ Meile, i. 165.

² This beautiful symbol was first appointed as a token to Noah, and men after him, of God's covenant-promise that the *earth* should ever after be preserved from destruction by a *flood of waters*. (See Gen. ix. 13—17.) In Isaiah liv. 9 it was transferred, as it were, to be a token of the sureness of the *gospel* promises, and of God's covenant to remember, preserve, and ultimately save his *Church* (both Jewish and Gentile) with an everlasting salvation. "In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer.—For this is as the *waters of Noah* unto me. For as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth, so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee (i. e. for perpetuity.) For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the *covenant of my peace* be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee."

The hint having been thus given as to its new and yet more beautiful appropriation, the symbol was afterwards exhibited to Ezekiel (i. 28), in accompaniment of the visions that foreshowed him indeed Judah's temporary abandonment to judgment, but with everlasting redemption as the final issue. And so again to St. John, as we have seen, in the Apocalyptic visions; both here, and in the standing scenery of the throne in the inner heavenly temple, described Apoc. iv. 3.

Father, full of *grace* and *truth*.”—In the sun-shine of this forgiving love, the former overwhelming bitterness of his sense of *sin* yielded to sweeter sensations. “O happy sin,” was his very heart’s language, “which hast found such a Redeemer!”¹ The subject of *repentance* too was now as sweet as once it had been bitter to him. He sought out in the Bible, (that precious volume with a copy of which the Vicar-general had personally enriched him,) all that related to it: and the Scriptures that spoke upon the subject seemed, he tells us, as if they danced in joy round his emancipated soul.²—Nor in the delight of these perceptions of the Divine forgiving love and mercy did he rest content and inactive. He found in them, as his evangelist and friend had assured him he would, a spring and a power for the pursuit of holiness altogether unfelt before. The love of Christ constrained him. From the view of Jesus he drew *strength*, as well as *righteousness*.—In the course of the two or three years next following, the variations both internal and external with which the lot of man is ever affected, and not these alone, but dangerous illnesses also, tested the truth and power of the new views he had received of gospel-salvation;—an illness in the convent at Erfurt,³—another afterwards at Bologna, when on a mission from the Augustinian Friars to Rome. The result was his confirmation in their truth and preciousness. For a little while indeed, when at Romè on the occasion last mentioned, the ideas so long cherished of its local sanctity, and the influence of early associations, induced his momentary return, in regard of outward observances, to the old superstition. With a devoutness which astonished and drew ridicule on him from the Romish clergy, he made

¹ “O beata culpa quæ talem meruisti Redemptorem.” Merle d’Aub. i. 170.—This was after the suggestion by an aged monk, who visited Luther on occasion of his falling ill in the convent, of that article in the Creed, “I believe in the remission of sins:”—a suggestion applied by God’s Spirit, with great power, to the strengthening of his mind in its peace in believing.

² *Ib.* i. 166.—Michelet (i. 12) quotes a passage from Luther of similar effect: “Il me sembla que j’entraisi à portes ouvertes dans le paradis.”

³ This illness occurred in the second year passed by him in the Convent at Erfurt; and is the one to which I refer in the Note last but one preceding.

the round of its churches, celebrating masses in them, as that which might yield a blessing to the devotee. He even climbed on his knees the *Pilate staircase*, near the Lateran, brought it was said from Jerusalem; on hearing that to the so climbing it there attached a *papal indulgence* and *remission of sin*. But, while in the act of climbing, a voice as from heaven sounded in his ears, “The justified *by faith* shall live:” they and they only.¹ He started up in horror at himself, on the heavenly monition; and the superstitions he had been educated in had never more influence or power, to obscure or to distract his vision of the Sun of Righteousness.

Thus was Luther inwardly prepared for the work that Providence intended him. It remained that he should act as God’s chosen minister, to set before others, in all its glory and its power, what he had himself seen and felt. Already a fit sphere of action had been provided for the purpose. A university had been just recently founded at Wittenberg by the Elector of Saxony. Of the arrangements a principal part had devolved on Stau-pitz. Impressed with a sense of Luther’s intellectual powers and piety, he summoned him to a professorship in the university. The call of his Vicar-General was obeyed, as in duty bound, by the young Augustinian monk: and being appointed in the University Doctor of Divinity *ad Biblia*, and having to vow on his appointment to defend the Bible doctrines, he received therein, as it has been said, *his vocation as a reformer*.² It was another epoch in his history.—Forthwith in his lectures to the students, and in his sermons too in the old church of the Augustines to the people, (for ordained as he had already been to the *priest’s* office, he neglected not like others the priest’s duty of *evangelic preaching*,)³ he opened to them the Gospel that had been opened to him, and set before them the glory of JESUS, mighty to save. His letters and private ministrations still dwelt on the same favourite theme. “Learn, my brother,” was the

¹ Merle, i. 187.² *Ib.* 174.³ *Ib.* 171, 176.

tenor of his perpetual exhortation, “to know Christ,—Christ crucified,—Christ come down from heaven to dwell with sinners. Learn to sing the new song; *Thou Jesus art my righteousness; I am thy sin: Thou hast taken on thyself what was mine; Thou hast given me what is thine!*”¹—Against the schoolmen, and their scholastic doctrine of man’s ability and strength to attain to righteousness in religion, he published *Theses*, and offered to sustain them; his text being, *Christ is our strength and our righteousness*. Thus did he attack *rationalism*, as it has been well said, before he attacked *superstition*; and proclaimed the *righteousness of God*, before he retrenched the *additions of man*.² Multitudes crowded from different parts to the University to hear a doctrine so new, and expounded with eloquence so convincing. “It seemed,” says Melancthon, “as if a new day had risen on Christian doctrine, after a long and dark night.”³ The eyes of men were directed to the true Sun of Righteousness, as risen upon them, (and many saw and felt it,) with healing in his wings.

Thus far the manifestation of gospel-light, however glorious, had been comparatively noiseless and tranquil. There had been simply a revelation of Himself by the Lord Jesus to the favoured ones at Wittenberg, in his characters of the Sun of Righteousness, and the rainbow-vested Angel of the Covenant, mighty to save. But now the calm was to end. There was to be added his roaring, like as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, against the usurping enemy; and so the conflict to commence between these two mighty antagonist principles and powers, between Christ and Antichrist. The infamous Tetzl

¹ *Ib.* i. 203.—Similarly *Zuingle*, the Swiss Reformer; “Mon esprit se ravime à l’ouïe de cette joyeuse nouvelle; Christ est ton innocence; Christ est ta justice; Christ est ton salut; tu n’es rien; tu ne peux rien: Christ est l’Alpha et l’Omega.” *Merle D’Aub.* ii. 348; also 320, &c.

I wish again to impress on the reader that it is not simply *Luther*, but the reforming Fathers generally, that I conceive St. John to have impersonated at this epoch:—though Luther most prominently of course, as being the chief leader of the Reformation. ² *Merle*, 209, 225.

³ *Ib.* 201.—So *Scultetus*, on A. D. 1517: “As once from Zion, so now from Wittenberg, the *light of gospel truth* was diffused into the remotest realms.” *Seckendorf*, p. 59.

precipitated the conflict. Approaching in prosecution of his commission to the near neighbourhood of Wittenberg,¹ (it was some eight or nine years after Luther's removal thither from Erfurt,) he there proclaimed, as elsewhere, the Papal Bulls of grace and indulgence; in other words set forth the *Pope* as the heaven-sent dispenser of mercy, the Sun of Righteousness,² and source of all divine light, grace, and salvation.—Then was the spirit of the reformer kindled within him. His Lord's honour was assailed, his Lord's little flock troubled by the impostor. Little thinking of the effect they were to produce, he published his celebrated 95 Theses against Indulgences; affixing them, according to the custom of the times, to the door of the chief church at Wittenberg, and offering to maintain them against all impugnors. The truths most prominently asserted in them were the Pope's utter insufficiency to confer forgiveness of sin or salvation,—Christ's all-sufficiency,—and the true spiritual penitent's participation, by God's free gift, and independent altogether of Papal indulgence or absolution, not merely in the blessing of forgiveness, but in all the riches of Christ. There were added other declarations, also very notable, as to the Gospel of the glory and grace of God, not the merits of saints, “being the

¹ The Elector of Saxony, at the request of Staupitz, had interdicted Tetzel from entering his territories on the Indulgence-selling commission. Hence he was unable to approach Wittenberg nearer than Jüterbock, the last town of the Archbishop of Magdeburg, his patron, and about four miles distant. *Ib.* 253.

² I here take the opportunity of adding three other illustrations of this pretension of the Popes to those already given: the *first* in an extract from Ambrosius Ansbertus, vindicating Irenæus' suggestion of *Teitan*, as possibly the Beast's intended name with the number 666, because of *Teitan* being a name of the *Sun*, and of its being a thing to be expected, that *Antichrist* would exhibit himself as the *Sun of Righteousness*: the *second* to the same effect from Thomas Aquinas: the *third* from Huss, charging the preachers of his day with precisely so setting forth the *Pope*.—1. Ambrose Ansbert. “Nec absurdum habet intellectum ut damnatus ille homo tunc *solem se justitiæ* asserat, ac lucem veram quæ illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum; cùm sit in eo apostata angelus transfigurans se in angelum lucis, suadens hominibus se lucem “eram profiteri, quos vult à luce justitiæ separare.” B. P. M. xiii. 552.—2. T. Aquinas. “Effudit phialam in *solem*: id est *Antichristum*; qui se *solem* existimabit, et dicit mundum illuminatum per eum esse. Ipse enim usurpabit nomen veri solis, id est Christi: de quo dicitur, ego sum lux mundi.” De Antichristo p. 103. (Rome 1840.)—3. Huss. “Ye preachers who preach that the Pope is the God of the earth, . . . that he is the well-spring from which flows all virtue and goodness, that he is the *Sun* of the Holy Church!” Apud Foxe, Vol. iii. p. 502.

true and precious treasure of the Church ;”—a denunciation of the avarice and soul-deceivings of the priestly traffickers in indulgences ;—and a closing exhortation to Christians to follow CHRIST as *their* chief, even through crosses and tribulation, thereby at length to attain to his heavenly kingdom.¹—Bold indeed were the words thus published ; and the effect such, that the evening of their publication has been remembered ever afterwards, and is ever memorable, as the epoch of the Reformation. With a rapidity, power, and effect unparalleled, unexpected, unintended, even as if it had been the voice of one mightier than Luther speaking through him,—and so Luther himself felt it,²—the voice echoed through continental Chris-

¹ Thus in the following sentences, as given by Merle, i. 263, &c :

1. “ Lorsque Jesus Christ dit, Repentez vous, il veut que toute la vie de ses fidèles soit une continuelle repentance.

2. Cette parole ne peut être entendue du sacrement de la penitence, ainsi qu’il est administré par le prêtre.

5. Le Pape ne peut (ni ne veut) remettre aucune autre peine que celle qu’il a imposée.

6. Le Pape ne peut *remettre* aucune condamnation, mais seulement *declarer* et *confirmer* la remission que Dieu lui même en a faite : à moins qu’il ne fasse dans les cas qui lui appartiennent : (i. e. of ecclesiastical censures.) S’il fait autrement la condamnation reste entièrement la même.

8. Les lois de la penitence ecclesiastique ne regardent nullement les morts.

32. Ceux qui s’imaginent être sûrs de leur salut par les indulgences iront au diable avec ceux qui le leur enseignent.

32. Esperer être sauvé par les indulgences est une esperance de mensonge et de néant, quand même le commissaire d’indulgences, et (que dis je ?) le pape lui-même, voudroit pour l’assurer mettre son âme en gage.

36. Chaque vrai Chretien, mort ou vivant, a part de tous les biens de Christ, par le don de Dieu, et sans lettre d’indulgence.

62. Le veritable et précieux trésor de l’eglise est le saint Evangile de la gloire et de la grâce de Dieu.

79. Dire que la croix ornée des armes du Pape est aussi puissante que la croix de Christ est un blaspheme.

94. Il faut exhorter les Chretiens s’appliquer à suivre Christ, leur chef, à travers les croix, la mort, et l’enfer :

95. Car il vaut mieux qu’ils entrent par beaucoup de tribulations dans le royaume des cieus, que d’acquérir une securité charnelle par les consolations d’une fausse paix.”

The reader will observe the saving clause for the Pope in Prop. 5, “ni ne veut.” Others occur elsewhere. So Prop. 50 : “Si le Pape connaissait les exactions des predicateurs d’indulgences, il aimerait mieux que la metropole de St. Pierre fût brûlée, que de la voir edifiée avec le peau, la chair, et les os de ses brebis.” As yet Luther knew not the Pope.

² After the 2nd Diet of Nuremberg 1524, Luther wrote to Spalatine : “I wish our simple Princes and Bishops would at length open their eyes ; and see that the present revolution in religion is not brought about by Luther, but by the omnipotence of Christ himself.” Milner p. 824.—And so again to Erasmus ; “What am I ? what but, as the wolf said to the nightingale, A voice and nothing else.” *Vox et præterea nihil.* Mich. i. 56. Indeed his sense of his having been but the

tendom, and through insular England also. It was felt by both friends and foes to be a mortal shock, not merely against indulgences, but against the whole system of penances, self-mortification, will-worship, and every means of justification from sin, devised by superstition, ignorance, or priestly cunning, and accumulated in the continued *apostacy* of above ten centuries;—a mortal shock too, though Luther as yet knew it not, against the *Papal supremacy* in Christendom. For there had been implanted in mens' minds, both on the *main-land* and the *island*, a view of Christ's glory, rights, and head-ship in the Church, which, notwithstanding the support of the Papacy by most of the powers of this world, was not to be obliterated. The result was soon seen both in the one, and in certain countries of the other, (including some of the *Swiss Cantons*, as I must now add, brought under the independent but contemporary guidance of *Zwingle* and other Reformers to the recognition very similarly both of Christ and Antichrist,) I say the result was there seen in the national erection of the Gospel standard, the overthrow of the Papal dominion, and the establishment of Churches pure and reformed, that acknowledged Christ alone as in *spiritual* things their Master. Adopting the symbols of the Apocalyptic vision, we may say that the fixing of his right foot on the sea, and his left on the main-land, was thus fulfilled, in sequence to the uttering of his voice as when a lion roareth. Nor did He quit the ground, or

mouth of a Higher One than himself in the matter appeared continually. So a correspondent of Melancthon writes of Luther; "Three hours of each day he spends in prayer. Once I happened to hear him. It is entirely, he said, thine own concern. We by thy Providence have been compelled to take a part." Again, after his burning the Pope's Bull; "Christus ista cepit; ipse perficiet:" &c. Merle, ii. 141. Similarly Zwingle. "To whom are we indebted as the cause of all this new light and new doctrine? To God, or to Luther? Ask Luther himself. I know that he will answer that the work is of God."—Luther was absolutely troubled in conscience, when he saw an effect so much beyond what he had intended, produced by his Theses. See Merle, i. 283; also my next Chapter. Thus the voice as of a lion roaring is ascribed to the *Angel*: what Luther and the Reformers did afterwards with full consciousness is attributed to their representative *St. John*.—Compare Matt. x. 20; "It is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you." Also 2 Peter i. 21; "Holy men spake, ὅπο πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι" borne out of themselves, and beyond their own intentions, as it were, in what they said.

remove the marked stamp of his interference, till the political overthrow had been accomplished, both in the one locality and the other, of a part of the mystic Babylon: in short until, as stated in the conclusion of this vision, “a tenth part of the city had fallen, and there had been slain in it names of men seven chiliads;”¹ a pledge of its ultimate overthrow, and of the establishment on its ruins of Christ’s universal kingdom.—But in this last observation I anticipate.

§ 2. DISCOVERY OF ANTICHRIST THE USURPER.

“And when He had cried, the seven thunders uttered their own voices.² And when the seven thunders uttered their own voices I was about to write. And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Seal up the things which the seven thunders uttered, and write them not!”
Apoc. x. 3, 4.

We have traced the *first* great step in the Reformation, as prefigured in the opening verses of the vision under consideration. It remains to trace the next, as prefigured in the two verses that follow, and which stand prefixed to the present Section.

In order to this, however, there will be needed in the first instance, a very careful sifting of the prophetic enunciation that develops it.—What mean *the seven thunders*?—This is the question that meets us at the outset of our enquiry. The careful attention needed to solve it will appear the more strikingly from the perplexity that it has occasioned to commentators, and the evident unsatisfactoriness of all their solutions. Many, because of the charge to St. John, “Seal up the things which the seven thunders uttered, and write them not,” have passed it over as a point never to be revealed, and there-

¹ My reason for so translating will appear in chap. ix infra.

² ελαλησαν ἃ ἑπτα βρονται τας ἑαυτων φωνας. The readings both of the ἃ and of the τας ἑαυτων are undoubted.

fore presumptuous to enquire into.¹ But if such be the meaning, wherefore the description of his hearing and being about to write them, here given, and its handing down in the Apocalyptic Book, as if for the benefit of the church, and as a part of the inspired prophecy?—Others have supposed it a pre-intimation of the septenary division of the seventh Trumpet; ² a supposed pre-intimation altogether unmeaning, as well as out of place.—Three commentators only, of those I am acquainted with, interpret the thunders as significative of *actual events*; viz. *Vitringa*, who explains them of the seven Crusades; ³ *Daubuz*, who makes them the echo of laws, affirmatory of the protestant doctrines of seven kingdoms that embraced the Reformation; and *Keith*, whose explanation refers them to the seven continental wars, characterized by the roar of “the modern artillery,” which intervened, he says, to fill up the period between the Reformation as begun by Luther, and the sounding of the seventh Trumpet at the French Revolution. These solutions carry their own refutation with

¹ So Mede (see the next note); also Bishop Newton, Woodhouse, Lowman. Hales passes it over, probably on the same account, in silence. In reference to earlier commentators, I may just notice that both Primasius and Ambrosius Ansbertus explain the seven thunders of *Gospel preaching*, such as the *seven-fold Spirit of God* might indite;—though terribly puzzled, as well they might be on any such hypothesis, to explain the prohibition, Write it not! “Valde nodosissima, atque ad solvendum perplexa nobis quæstio,” is what Ansbertus calls it.—A curious quotation from Origen occurs in Eusebius, (Ec. Hist. vi. 25,) on the same subject. In his list of the canonical writers of the sacred Scriptures, on coming to St. John, he thus briefly and enigmatically notices the passage under consideration; Εγραψε δε και την Αποκαλυψιν κελευθεισι σιωπησαι και μη γραψαι τας των επτα βροντων φωνας.

² So first Mede; at the same time that he intimates the vanity of inquiring into what God has chosen to make secret, as stated in the note preceding. “Vox tonitruum quid? Si *Bath Kol*, erunt septem Tonitrua oracula totidem quibus septimæ Tubæ intervallum quasi periodis quibusdam distinguetur; sed ignorandæ omnino rei, nec nisi suis temporibus percipiendæ. Quod innuit Joanni, voces tonitruum scripturo, cælitus facta prohibitio, *Obsigna quæ locuta sunt septem tonitrua, et nē ea scribas*. Frustra igitur nos inquirendo erimus quæ Deus occulta esse voluit, et suis temporibus reservanda.”

After Mede, Mr. Cuninghame and Mr. Bickersteth have offered explanations substantially similar; supposing the Thunders to be emblems or warnings of the seven Vials of the seventh Trumpet. And so too Mr. Faber; S.C. i. 264—270.

³ It is to be remembered that Vitringa does not explain the vision of the covenant-Angel's descent, or the little book opened in his hand, of the Reformation; so that his interpretation does not involve *that* chronological inconsistency with itself.

them. Vitringa's is quite out of place, as referring to events long preceding the Reformation: and as to those of Mr. Daubuz and Mr. Keith, without entering into other particulars, who can believe that the injunction, "Seal up what the thunders have uttered, and write them not," could mean, either as the one says, a prophetic check to the multiplication and progress of protestant institutions, beyond the original seven protestant kingdoms; ¹—or, as the other, a mysterious concealment of the seven great wars that followed the Reformation, because the minds of men, being then inclined to hold to *Scripture prophecies as rules of action* would, in case of those wars having been clearly predicted, have thrown themselves into them as with Scripture warrant? ²

In the phraseology of this remarkable passage, there are to be noted five things:—1st, the *vocality* of the thunders spoken of, for they are said to have voices:—2ndly, *the absoluteness of the prohibition*, "Seal up and write them not:"—3rdly, the singular definition of the voices of the thunders as *their own voices*:—4thly, *the distinctive article* prefixed to and defining the thunders intended:—5thly, their further definition by the *septenary numeral*. To which five phraseological characteristics of the *thunders* there must be added further the consideration of *St. John's symbolic character* on the Apocalyptic scene. This done, all will be clear, I doubt not, as to the signification of the prophecy; and nothing more needed than a reference to history to make its fulfilment clear also.

1st, then, there is to be observed the *vocality* attributed to the *thunders*; the thunders being said, twice over, to have *voices* and to *speak*, evidently in a manner intelligible to St. John. By this they are distinguished

¹ Daubuz, p. 472.

² Vol. ii. p. 17; "Never perhaps in the whole history of man was there a time when the prophecies of Scripture would have been so readily held as rules of action, rather than reasons of faith; and the perfection of wisdom in respect to them (sc. the prophetic Thunders) may have been even that they were not written."

from the thunders elsewhere mentioned in the Apocalyptic visions as proceeding from the throne: the which were known indeed to be sounds of wrath and judgment from on high, echoed in the judgments forthwith following on earth, but still sounds not articulate or intelligibly vocal. Such being the case, the thunders mentioned in the 12th of St. John's Gospel offer themselves to our remembrance as the nearest Scripture parallel to those before us: for we read that there was heard in *them* also an articulate voice from heaven; the which the people around thought the voice of an angel, and of which the words are actually given us.¹ This says Mede, was by the Jews called *Bath Kol*, בַּת קוֹל; i. e. as he translates it, a *voice from heaven*, or *oracle*. The inference of course respecting the thunders *here* spoken of is, that they too, as they fell on St. John's ear, fell intelligibly as an *oracle* or *voice from heaven*.

2. We are to note the *absoluteness of the heavenly prohibition*, "*Seal up the things which the seven thunders have uttered, and write them not!*" Now had there been merely the first injunction, "*Seal them up,*" instead of indicating the same thing as the *temporary* sealing spoken of in Daniel xii. 4, 9, ("*Seal up till the time of the end,*") with which not a few expositors have unadvisedly compared it,² we might rather have inferred the *total* consignment of these oracular voices to *oblivion*; seeing that no period, however distant, was assigned for *their* unsealing. But besides this, there was added, as if by way of explanation, the further and yet more emphatic prohibitory clause, of which the absoluteness could not be mistaken, "*Write them not!*"—And what the reason of the prohibition? Surely it was as

¹ John xii. 28; "There came a voice from heaven saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again. The people therefore that stood by, and heard it, said that it thundered. Others said, An angel spoke to him."

² So T. C. C. in the Investigator, Vol. iii. p. 146.—In truth, since the injunctions at the beginning and the end of the Apocalypse,—the one, (i. 19,) "*Write what thou hast seen,*" &c. the other, (xxii. 10,) "*Seal not up the sayings of the prophecy of this book,*"—necessarily include this vision and the thunders, just as all the rest, among what was to be written and revealed, they seem of themselves sufficient to refute the interpretation of which I have been speaking.

simply as satisfactorily to be inferred from the reasons of the contrary injunction, "Write them," given three times elsewhere to St. John, on occasion of his hearing other voices as from heaven. First that in ch. xiv. 13; "I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write! Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, *Even so saith the Spirit.*" Next in ch. xix. 9; "He saith unto me, Write! Blessed are they which are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb. And He said, These are the *true sayings of God.*" Once more in ch. xxi. 5; "He said, Behold I make all things new. And He said to me, Write! for *these words are true and faithful.*" These are all the examples of the kind that occur, from the beginning of the prediction of things future in ch. iv. to the end of the Book. And in every case the reason given for the Apostle's writing was of one and the same character; viz. because the voice that was to be written was true and faithful, because it was the voice of the Spirit, because it was the true saying of God. The necessary inference as to the reason of the *prohibition*, "Write not!" is this;—that what the seven thunders uttered, although *apparently* a Bath-Kol, or oracular voice from heaven, was *not* true and faithful, *not* the voice of the Spirit, *not* the true saying of God;—but, instead thereof, *false* and *an imposture*.

3. Directly accordant with which is the inference from that most singular definition of the voices of the thunders as *their own* voices;—a singularity the more observable because it is with marked emphasis *repeated*.¹ For what can the phrase imply but this, that the voices of these thunders were in direct contrast, and apparent opposition, to that voice of the Covenant-Angel, spoken of in the clause next preceding, that was like a lion's roaring?—Which being so, let me ask, as the Angel's voice was that of *Christ*, does not the probability suggest itself of the voice of the thunders opposed being that of *Antichrist*? Certainly the sup-

¹ Viz. in the verse following; "And when the seven thunders had uttered their *own* voices."

position seems thus far well to suit. For the voices of the *Pope*, exprest in his decrees and bulls, were, we know, regarded as oracles¹ from heaven : indeed the name most commonly given to them, when condemnatory, was that of Papal *thunders*.—In corroboration of which supposition let me add that this appendage of the Papal Antichrist is recognized elsewhere in the Apocalypse as one of his most notable characteristics : it being stated in chap. xiii as among the signs wrought by him before men, that he would cause fire to come down from heaven upon the earth ; meaning thereby, as I must here beg leave to presume, the lightnings and thunders of excommunication from his mock heaven. Now what is deemed worthy of note in the one description, may the rather be supposed to be alluded to in the other.

4. We have to remark the distinctive prefix of the *definite article* attached, on their first mention, to these thunders. “When he had cried, *the seven thunders* uttered their voices.” The singularity and strangeness of this has been noticed by critics. So Bishop Middleton. “Why the article is inserted here, I am unable to discover :”—asking, as that which might solve the difficulty, “Were the seven thunders any thing *well known and pre-eminent* ?” and adding, as his own supposition, that there may probably have been a reference to some Jewish opinion, giving them this notoriety ; of which however, he says, he found not a vestige. Had the learned prelate advanced thus far with us in the historical exposition of the Apocalypse, methinks he would have seen the solution of the critical difficulty in the very fact that he suspected of the notoriety and pre-eminence of the thunders spoken of : not however as

¹ So in the oration of Corvinus of Naples to Pope Julius II ; “*Sed me tua jussa, tua divina oracula, quæ servare religiosum, detrectare nefas est, ad dicendum impulerunt.*” Roscoe’s Leo X ; Vol. ii. 376.—This title is still given to the Pope’s decrees. In a debate in the House of Lords, in July 1838, the Bishop of Exeter stated that the Romish Bishop of Malta could not, as he said, take the oath to the Supreme Council till he had the *oraculum* of the Pope permitting it. Again, in the Pope’s address to his Consistory on the erection of the bishoprick of Algiers, there was mention made of the Bishop of Cologne having received the *oraculum* of the Pope.

recognized by the *Jewish cotemporaries of St. John*, but as recognized by the *inhabitants of Roman Christendom*, and *at that time* to which the prophetic vision had reference. For we have already seen reason to suspect, from the three previously noted characteristics, that these thunders were the voices of the Papal Antichrist. And does it need any thing more than the mere mention of them to satisfy us as to *their* notoriety and pre-eminence? In a subordinate sense each synod, each primate, indeed each bishop, might issue ecclesiastical thunders, within his or its sphere and diocese. But the *Papal* bulls and anathemas¹ were emphatically *the* thunders, the Pope *the* thunderer.² Regarded as he was in the light of God's Vicar on earth, there was supposed to be the condemning voice of God Himself in the thunderbolts of his wrath. Invested with which terrors by the prevailing superstition, throughout the long middle ages, where was the kingdom in Western Europe that did not tremble,—where the heart so stout, of noble or of prince, that did not quail before them?

5. There remains the distinctive of the *septenary numeral*. And this indeed is all that is wanted to complete the evidence of the *Papal* thunders being those intended. For we are not to regard it merely as affixed to the thunders in question because of its being the sacred number, and so a further indication of their claim to sacredness of character; although possibly this too might be intended, considering the common papal affectation in adopting the number.³ There is

¹ This metaphorical term was early applied to the anathemas and decrees of Bishops and Synods; more especially those of the Roman See, as representing the apostles Peter and Paul. So in Venantius Honorius, a writer of the sixth century: (Bibl. Patr. Max. x. 541:)

Cœlorum portæ, lati duo lumina mundi,
Ore tonat Paulus, fulgurat ense Petrus.

Martene de Antiq. Eccles. Rit. Vol. ii. p. 322, (Bassano, 1788) gives four specimens of Papal excommunicating thunders. The most elaborate of all, that against Luther, may be seen in Harduin's Councils, Foxe's Martyrs, and elsewhere.

² So in Capito's Elegia ad Elephantem; (Roseoe's Leo X, App. C.)

Sic Latio poteris gratissimus esse Tonanti;

i. e. to the Pope.

³ In Bellarmine's "Christian Doctrine," for example, we find noticed seven

something, I doubt not, much more pointed and characteristic intended chiefly by the numeral; a something which history will readily suggest to us, and which the Apocalyptic account of Antichrist, given afterwards, might equally well have suggested to St. John. For what in the 17th chapter of this prophetic Book was told him of the *locality of the throne of Antichrist*? It was this,—that it would be seated upon *the seven hills*, the fated seven hills, of *Rome*.¹ *Thence* were his thunders and lightnings to issue.—Now it accords with the figurative style, alike in prophecy and in poetry, to apply the numeral distinction of the parts characterizing the locality, whence a voice or other emanation might issue, to that voice or emanation itself. So, for example, in a choric ode of Euripides, we find the oracular light flashing from Parnassus called the *two-topped* lightning, in the sense of lightning from the *two* Parnassian *summits*.² Just similarly the *seven thunders* are explicable as being thunders from the *seven hills* of Rome: and may indeed have pealed on the Evangelist's ear from some septenary elevation, marked as such in its proper locality on the Apocalyptic scene.³—And the truth is, that this specification of the locality has, in the case before us, a peculiar point and propriety. For so it was, that the locality of *Rome* seemed necessary to give the Papal thunders their full sacredness and authority in the estimation of Christendom. During the 70 years secession of the Popes to Avignon, this became notorious. It is remarked on by Mosheim.⁴ It is remarked on again by Le Bas.

sacraments, seven principal virtues, seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, seven works of mercy, seven capital vices.—In the Romish ceremonies, too, as that of christening Church bells, the same number is often adopted. Catholic Magazine, Oct. 1838. Again the Romish *orders* are seven.

¹ Apoc. xvii. 9.

² Phœnissæ, 234 :

Ἰω λαμπρὰ πετρα
Πυρὸς δικορυφὸν σέλας
ὑπὲρ ἀκρῶν βακχείων'

On which the Scholiast thus observes: Δικορυφὸν αὐτὸν εἶπεν, ἐπεὶ περ ἐν ἀμφοτέροις ταῖς ἀκραῖς τῆ Παρνασσῆ εἰσὶν ἱέρα, τὸ μὲν Ἀρτεμίδος καὶ Ἀπολλωνος, τὸ δὲ Διονυσίου.

³ Compare Vol. I. pp. 102, 339.

⁴ xiv. 2. 2. 5; "The Europeans in general were far from paying so much regard to the decrees and thunders of the *Gallie* Popes, as they did to those of *Rome*."

The language of the latter, more especially, is quite illustrative of the phrase we are discussing. "The *thunders*," he says, "which shook the world when they issued from the *seven hills*, sent forth an uncertain sound, comparatively faint and powerless, when launched from a region of less elevated sanctity."¹ In effect the seven hills seemed, like Olympus of old, to be an almost necessary *earthly* adjunct to the mock ideal *heaven* of the Papal Antichrist's Apostolic supremacy.²

And now then I think I may say that the signification of the seven thunders here spoken of is clear. The five Apocalyptic distinctives answer completely, one and all, to the thunders of the Vatican: nor, I will be bold to say, is there anything else whatsoever, to which they can with the slightest semblance of plausibility be made to answer.—And when, their signification being thus settled, we next enquire whether what is said in the prophecy of the seven thunders uttering their voices of opposition, immediately on the Angel's lion-like roar, had its fulfilment in the utterance of *Papal* thunders against Christ's voice by Luther, it need only that we look into the historic page to see it. Scarce had Luther published his Theses when the attack on them by Sylvester Prierias, the official Censor at Rome, and which was dedicated to Pope Leo, showed what was to be expected from the Pope himself: and, ere a year had elapsed, a solemn Papal Bull condemnatory of Luther's Theses, and in defence of the whole system of indulgences, was committed to Cardinal Caietan, and by him presently after published.

It is added, "And when the seven Thunders had uttered their own voices, *I was about to write*;" &c. We have here a statement which will be found to lead us forward another step, and a most important one, in the history of the Reformation. In order however to our drawing this inference from it, it will be necessary that we recall and apply that important exegetic principle, to the

¹ Life of Wicliff, p. 198.

² See p. 81, Note 7 *suprà*.

which I alluded already earlier in this Section,—namely, of *St. John's symbolic character* on the Apocalyptic scene.

For I trust that the reader will by this time have become not only familiarized with, but convinced of the truth of, this most important view of the Evangelist's character, in the figurations of the apocalyptic drama: it having been in various ways not only illustrated by me from parallel prophetic scriptures,¹ and patristic authorities,² but also confirmed from history, in the preceding Volume. It will be remembered *generally* that what was seen and heard by him on the apocalyptic scene, appeared to be that which would be seen and heard by the faithful, whom at each successive epoch in the advancing drama he presignified; whether the desolations of war, mutations of empire, or persecutions, sufferings, impressions, and worshippings of Christ's people themselves.³ More especially he will remember that memorable *sealing vision*, just before the bursting of the Trumpet-judgments, wherein was exhibited to St. John a

¹ Even in unfigurative scripture it may be well to observe that this typical principle often holds. Thus when Christ said, "I am with you always, even to the end of the world," he evidently regarded the whole succession of faithful ministers as summed up in the apostles before him. And so too in St. Paul, "Take heed to *thyself*, and to *thy doctrine*;" and again, "Then *we* which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up &c."—The same in the Old Testament perpetually. So, for instance, in the precept, "*Thou* shalt teach them to thy children;" a precept intended for Israel's successive generations. In some passages the pronoun means *future* generations only. So Deut. xii. 14; "In the place which the Lord shall choose, there shalt thou offer thy burnt-offerings &c: which could only apply to Israel from the time of Solomon's building his temple at Jerusalem.

² See Vol. I. p. 263, Note 3.—Among ancient apocalyptic expositors Tycho-nius, Primasius, and Ambrosius Ansbertus may be specified as having recognized this principle of interpretation; and the two latter partially carried it into their interpretation of the vision we are discussing. Primasius on Apoc. v. 4, "I wept much because no one was found to open the Book," (a passage similarly explained by me, Vol. I. p. 95) thus first announces the principle; "Ecclesia in Johanne flebat:" and Ambrosius Ansbertus; "Non in sua personâ flevisse creditur: Ecclesiam in sua personâ flevisse creditur. . . . cujus hoc in loco figuram gerit."—Again on the passage before us Ansbertus observes; "Dicatur igitur Johanni, imo unicuique prædicatori in Johanne, Signa quæ locuta sunt septem tonitrua, et noli ea scribere."—I shall in a subsequent chapter quote at large both his and Primasius' application of the principle, in explaining the verses 9—11.

Among the moderns Vitringa, Daubuz, Cuninghame (p. 89) &c, have also (as observed Vol. I. p. 266) *stated* the principle. But, excepting Daubuz, the use they have made of it is very small; and what they have seems from its fitfulness and inconsistency almost valueless.

³ Compare particularly Vol. I. pp. 196—206, 313, 474.

manifestation of Christ, as rising with light from the East, and selecting and sealing his own people from amidst the professing Israel ; (a revelation evidently such as the world in general would not have perception of ;) and then the prospective vision expended of the ultimate salvation and glory of the redeemed, wherein he actually held colloquy with some of the twenty-four presbyters round the throne :—all which, otherwise enigmatical and most obscure, seemed to be explained as simply as satisfactorily by reference to Christ's doctrinal revelation of Himself, and his electing grace, and the final assured salvation of his elect, to one that was St. John's truest successor in spirit at the chronological epoch corresponding, just before the Gothic invasions ; I mean *Augustine*.¹—And now behold the apostle in personal association with a yet brighter vision of Christ, and more glorious manifestation of Himself on the apocalyptic mundane scene, than even in the Sealing Vision ; and moreover yet more prominently, variedly, and remarkably acting out his own part in the dramatic vision. For we read of his rising up to meet the revelation, and, notwithstanding the cloud that mantled the Covenant-Angel, realizing the glory and the divinity of his aspect and his voice ;—then, on occasion of the seven thunders sounding, preparing to write, until deterred by a warning from heaven against it ;—then hearing a solemn declaration from the Covenant-Angel respecting the chronological place of this intervention in the great mundane drama, as separated by but one Trumpet more from the consummation ;—then, under the same heavenly impulse as before, going and taking the book out of the hand of the Covenant-Angel, and eating it, and tasting its sweetness and its bitterness ;—then receiving the Angel's solemn charge to prophesy again ;—then being presented with a reed, like unto a rod, wherewith to measure the temple and them that worshipped in it ;—then, finally, having the history of Christ's Witnesses

¹ See Vol. I. p. 267, &c.

through the dark ages preceding, even up to the time then present, retrospectively set before him. Which being so, supposing we are satisfied that St. John is to be viewed as a symbolic character, not merely will the *general* inference follow that there must have been prefigured hereby some singular *re-awakening* in the Church *at that time* of ministerial *apostolical spirit*, in all its energy of *action*,—such as in fact we know to have been the case, in measure unprecedented since apostolic times, with the Fathers of the Reformation, insomuch that historians can scarce speak of Luther more especially, and his first actings in the Reformation, without noticing the parallel,¹—but also, as to *details*, that each *particular* thing heard or done by the Evangelist in vision must have been meant to symbolize something correspondent in the views, history, and actions of these reforming Fathers, his successors in office and in spirit.

To show this is now my duty, as an apocalyptic expositor: and it will occupy us both in what remains of the present chapter, and also in the three next chapters, afterwards following.

For the present it is the meaning of the *first particular statement*, viz. “When the seven thunders had uttered their own voices *I was about to write*,” together with that of the clause following, “And *I heard a voice from heaven* saying unto me, *Seal up* those things which the seven thunders uttered, and *write them not*,” that claims our attention.

“And when the seven thunders uttered their own voices *I was about to write*.” Applying the principle of interpretation just laid down to this statement, the fact pre-signified seems clearly to be this—that those mem-

¹ “The commission,” says M. Merle D’Aubigné, “received by him was like one of those extraordinary ones received by the prophets under the old dispensation, by the apostles under the new.” Again; “It was thus that Luther joined hands with St. Paul across fifteen centuries:” and, as Michelet intimates, (i. 59, 278,) with St. John, as much as with St. Paul.—Among the medals struck at the Reformation I find one with this legend round Luther’s portrait, “*Lutherus Propheta Germaniæ* :” others with the legend, *Tertius Elias*. See Merle, i. 194, 340; Junckner *Vita Lutheri*, 24, 402.

bers of Christ's true Church whom we suppose St. John to have symbolized, Luther most of all, even after witnessing the glory and beauty of Christ's revelation of Himself as the Sun of Righteousness, would yet, on hearing the hostile Papal thunders, be ready to *receive and publish them*, as if they were what they professed to be, *a voice from heaven*. An intimation strange indeed! Was it possible that such could have been the case with *Luther*?—We look into history; and behold! we find this to have been the very case. Indeed it forms a feature so prominent and interesting in the history of the progress both of Luther's own mind and of the Reformation, that no ecclesiastical historian can properly develop the advance of that eventful history, without making a distinct reference to it.

The truth was that Luther formed acquaintance with the character of Christ some years before he formed it with that of Antichrist. The cry of the *Pope* being Antichrist, raised long previously by the followers of Waldo, Wicliff, and Huss, had almost died away in Christendom; and, if heard of by Luther at Erfurt or at Wittenberg, had been heard of only as a blasphemous heresy.¹ With a conscience very tender, and tremblingly afraid of offending God, the supposed sacredness and authority of the Pope, as head of the Church and Christ's Vicar, (for such in accordance with the long received superstition he as yet regarded him,) induced in his mind a predisposition to bow with implicit deference to the Papal decision, both in other things, and in the controversy about indulgences that he had engaged in. In his Theses nothing appeared against the authority of the Pope, but the contrary.² Listen to his own account of his feelings at this time, as given many years afterwards. "When I began the affair of the indulgences, I was a monk and a most mad Papist. So intoxicated

¹ This is evident from what he tells us of his original feelings of horror at Huss and Hussite doctrines, and his astonishment in at length finding them to be agreeable to the Gospel.

² Merle i. 269. "Cursed," it was said in one of them, "be he that doubts it!"—See too the end of Note 1 p. 99 *suprà*.

was I, and drenched in Papal dogmas, that I would have been most ready to murder, or assist others in murdering, any person who should have uttered a syllable against the duty of obedience to the Pope." And again; "Certainly at that time I adored him in earnest." He adds; "How distressed my heart was in that year 1517, and the following,—how submissive to the hierarchy, not feignedly but really,—those little know who at this day insult the majesty of the Pope with much pride and arrogance. . . . I was ignorant of many things which now, by the grace of God, I understand. I disputed; I was open to conviction. Not finding satisfaction in the works of theologians, I wished to consult the living members of the Church itself. There were some godly souls that entirely approved my propositions. But I did not consider their authority as of weight with me in spiritual concerns. The popes, bishops, cardinals, monks, priests, were the objects of my confidence. After being enabled to answer every objection that could be brought against me from sacred Scripture, one difficulty only remained,—that *the Church*" (the Roman Church) "ought to be obeyed.¹ If I had then braved the Pope as I do now, I should have expected every hour that the earth would have opened to swallow me up alive, like Korah and Abiram."²—It was in this frame of mind that in the summer of 1518, a few months after the affair with Tetzal, he wrote that memorable letter to the Pope, of which the tenor may be judged of from the clause following; and what can more admirably illustrate the passage we are considering? "Most blessed Father! prostrate at the feet of thy Blessedness, I offer myself to thee with all I am and all I have. Kill me or make me live, call or recal, approve or reprove, as shall please thee. I will acknowledge *thy voice* as the

¹ The two extracts are from two Prefaces by Luther, the one to an Edition of his Theses, published after the termination of the dispute, the other to an Edition of his Works, published in the year 1545, i. e. 28 years after the beginning of the dispute about indulgences.—See Milner's Church History, pp. 683, 684; also Merle i. 209, 253.

² Michelet i. 58.

voice of Christ presiding and speaking in thee.”¹ Thus when the *seven thunders uttered their own voices* he was *about to write*: i. e. as the word means,² to *receive, publish, submit to* them; even as if they had been what they pretended to be, an oracle from heaven.

But so it was that just at this critical point of temptation and danger a *real* voice from heaven, the voice of God’s Spirit, saying, “*Seal up* what the seven thunders have uttered, and *write them not*,” was his preservation. Already in the October of that year, on being summoned and appearing, as we have intimated, before the Papal Legate Cardinal Caietan, when the Pope’s judgment was affirmed by the Legate to be in favour of indulgences, and also of the efficacy of the sacraments *ex opere operato*, and independent of faith in the recipient,³—seeing its contradictoriness both to the word and spirit of the Gospel, he would not receive it. The Spirit’s whisper began, “*Write not!*” Still however for a while he remained partially in suspense. He doubted, indeed discredited, the fact of the Papal sanction.⁴ But soon after, when

¹ “*Quare, beatissime Pater, prostratum me pedibus tuæ Beatitudinis offero cùm omnibus quæ sum et habeo. Vivifica, occide, voca, revoca, approba, reproba, ut placuerit. Vocem tuam vocem Christi in te præsentis et loquentis agnoscam.*” This was in Luther’s first Letter to the Pope, written May 30, 1518. Merle i. 343.

² “*Quod palam scribimus,*” says Ansbertus, “*ad cunctorum notitiam deducimus.*” Compare Hab. ii. 2; “*Write the vision, and make it plain on tables, that he may run that readeth it.*”

Similar to this was the custom in the promulgation of *laws*, &c. among the ancients. And the same afterwards in regard of *Papal Bulls*. It was by *writing* them that they were published, on reception in any country. So in a Letter from Pope Paul II, in the year 1469, to the Archbishop of Lyons, in accompaniment of a Bull of Excommunication against George de Pogiebrat and the Hussites, he thus directs its promulgation: that it should be affixed in some public place, that all who wished might *read or transcribe* (*legere vel inde exemplum transcribere*); also that it should be read in the vulgar tongue before the people in all the churches three times in the year, at certain high festivals; and that, in order to all this, he, the Archbishop, was to send an *attested copy* of the Pope’s original Bull, *transcribed* literally by a notary public, to all his suffragans: “*juxtà idioma unius cujusque loci publicari facias; transmittens singulis ipsorum suffraganeorum unum, transumptum ad litteram originalis ipsius nostri, manu propii notarii, coràm testibus, ac tuo pendenti sigillo roboratum.*” Harduin ix. 1490.

³ See my Note I, p. 254, Vol. I; where this Papal advocacy in the 16th century of the *opus operatum* of sacraments is noticed in my sketch of the earliest development of this first great principle of the Apostacy, as unfolded in the 4th.

⁴ So in the Preface to his works already quoted from; “*I felt assured I should have the Pope on my side.*” Milner 684.

the publication of the Pope's Bull in direct sanction of indulgences¹ had forced him to identify the Pope himself with those antichristian abuses,—and yet more when in the year next following, on occasion of the approaching disputation with Eck,² he was brought into the necessity of examining the origin, foundation, and character of the Papal supremacy, then the real antichristian character of the Papacy began more and more to open to his view. About the end of 1518³ we find him writing to his friend Link, on sending him a copy of the acts just published of the conference at Augsburg, “My pen is ready to give birth to things much greater. I know not myself whence these thoughts come to me. I will send you what I write, that you may see if I have well conjectured in believing that the *Antichrist*, of whom St. Paul speaks, now reigns in the court of Rome.” For a while, however, he combated the thought, to him so fearful.⁴ Some three or four months after,—for it was no very long time before the dispute with Eck,—in answer to a request from the Elector of Saxony to be in all things reverential to the Pope, he wrote to Spalatinus, “To

¹ The Brief given to Cardinal Caietan was dated August 23, 1518. It included Luther's excommunication in case of obstinacy, also the excommunication of all his adherents; and, in case of *princes* protecting him, placed their territories under an interdict. Merle d'Aub. i. 354. It was not published by the Cardinal Legate till Dec. 13, 1518: but it was made known in substance to the Elector of Saxony very soon after the close of the conference at Augsburg: i. e. about the end of October.

² The disputation took place at Leipsic, June 27, 1519, and lasted till July 15. —The challenge had been given by Eck some time previous. He had published thirteen Propositions against the heresies of Lutheranism. Of these his first, and that on which he mainly grounded his confidence, was that the Pope was Christ's Vicar, and successor to St. Peter.

³ About the end of November 1518. So I infer from its notice in Merle D'Aubigné's History, i. 429.

⁴ It may seem strange that if in the November or December of 1518 Luther had begun to have thoughts respecting the Pope being Antichrist, he should in the April of 1519 have written to Spalatinus that he had no thought of separating from Rome. But the following extract will explain it to us. In a letter to the Augustins of Wittemberg, dated Nov. 1521, he thus recounts all that passed in his mind in the interval, and the manner in which he resisted, and for a time silenced, the thought as sinful. “Oh! qu'il m'en a coûté de peine, quoique j'eusse l'écriture de mon côté, pour me justifier par devant moi de ce que seul j'osai m'élever contre le Pape, et le tenir pour l'Antichrist, &c. 1—Ainsi je me débattais avec moi-même;—jusqu'à ce que *Jesus Christ*, par sa propre et infallible parole, me fortifiât, et dressât mon cœur contre cet argument.” Michelet i. 277.

separate myself from the Apostolic See of Rome, has not entered my mind." But now the views that he had hinted to Link pressed upon him with greater and greater force. The Elector was startled with hearing, "I have been turning over the Decretals of the Popes, with a view to the ensuing debate at Leipsic; and would whisper it into thine ears that I begin to entertain doubt (so is Christ dishonoured and crucified in them) whether the Pope be not the very Antichrist of Scripture."¹ Further study of Scripture, and further teaching of the Holy Spirit, concurred with the Pope's reckless support of all the anti-christian errors and abominations against which he had protested, (and well did the reminiscences too of his visit to Rome help on the conviction,)² to make what was for a while a suspicion only, an awful and certain reality to him. And when at length, in the summer of 1520, the Pope's Bull of anathema and excommunication came out against him, when the seven thunders pealed against the voice that the Covenant-Angel had uttered by him, with all their fury,—accordantly with that admonitory voice from heaven which bade his Apocalyptic representative St. John long before to "seal them up,"³ (the very phrase of the times, I may observe, for rejecting Papal Bulls, and consigning them to oblivion,⁴) he did an action by which all Europe was electrified. He summoned a vast concourse of all ranks outside the walls of Wittemberg; himself kindled a fire in a vast pile of wood previously prepared for the purpose; and, by the

¹ Merle d'Aub. ii. 13.

² "I would not for 100,000 florins but have seen Rome." Ib. i. 186.

³ "By the Spaniards, when they receive the Pope's Bulls, if they like them they are registered and published, i. e. executed accordingly. But if they do not like them, they are set by, being first lapped up, and no more is said about them. This they call *plegar la Bulla*, to *fold* or *seal up*, the Bull; i. e. to stop or hinder the execution of it, as being contrary to their customs or rights." Simon Lettres Choisis; ap. Daubuz 473: who however only quotes it in illustration of his own singular and totally different explanation of the clause, noticed by me at p. 102 *suprà*.

⁴ Compare Isa. viii. 16; "Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples:" where the *binding up* and *sealing* are, as in the above example, coincident. This passage is cited by Macknight in his comment on Heb. ii. 13; and he explains it to signify that the whole Mosaic œconomy was to be *laid aside*.—Compare also my Note 2, p. 115, on the *writing* of Papal Bulls by ecclesiastical functionaries, as a token of recognition of their authority.

hands of the common hangman, committed the Bull, together with the Papal Decretals,¹ Canons, &c. accompanying, to the flames. Moreover in his published Answer to the Bull he rejected and poured contempt on its thunders, as *the infernal voices of ANTICHRIST*.¹

Such was the memorable act that marked the completion of the first epoch of the Reformation. Once convinced by the heavenly teaching of this awful and so long unsuspected truth, no earthly terrors or power could induce from Luther its recantation. When summoned before the Emperor, Legate, and Germanic Princes and Nobles at the Diet of Worms,² the momentous cause intrusted to him was only strengthened by his intrepid confession.—Moreover he was now no longer alone, as once, in the undertaking. A goodly company,—Melancthon, Caroldtast, Bugenhagen, Justus Jonas, and many others, since known as Fathers of the Reformation,—had already joined themselves to him. In many too, perhaps in most, of the German universities and towns, by students and by people, and by not a few even of priests and monks also, the new doctrine had been embraced with enthusiasm: besides that in Switzerland too the work was progressing. It is the remark of his biographer, when arrived at this epoch of the Reformation, that at various times the world has seen the power of an *idea*, even of common and earthly origin, to penetrate society and rouse nations; how much more, he adds, when, as now, it was *an idea originating from heaven*.³

¹ Luther's Reply (which is given complete in Foxe, Vol. v. 660—668) bore date June 15, 1520; and was entitled, An Answer to the execrable Bull of Antichrist. "I hold," he says in it, "the author of this Bull to be *Antichrist*, and Rome the kingdom of Antichrist." "Is not thy whorish face ashamed," he adds, "to set the vanities of thy naked words against the thunderbolts of God's eternal word?" Again; "Dost thou not show thyself to be *the adversary*, extolled above all that is called God? Art thou not that *man of sin* that denieth God the Redeemer?" And then to Christian princes; "Ye have given your names to *Christ* in baptism: and can ye now abide these *infernal voices* of such an *Antichrist*?"

² Held from Jan. 6 to May 8, A. D. 1521.—Luther's arrival at Worms was on the 16th of April, his departure April 27; the former about four months therefore after his burning the Pope's Bull.

³ Merle D'Aubigné ii. 172; "Si une *idée humaine* a une telle force, quel pouvoir n'aura pas une *idée descendue du ciel*, quand Dieu lui ouvre la porte des cœurs!" He observes that the world has not often seen this: instancing in but

In this observation he is speaking of the new view spread abroad of Christ and Antichrist. And have we not a comment in it on the Apocalyptic statement, "I heard a voice from heaven saying to me, Write not!" The effect was seen and confessed by the astonished Legate, when, in travelling through Germany to Worms, instead of the wonted honors and reverence to his high office, he found himself disregarded and shunned as an *agent of ANTICHRIST*.¹ A mighty revolution, it was evident, had begun;—and who could foresee its issue?

CHAPTER V.

REVELATION OF THE ADVANCED CHRONOLOGICAL POSITION OF THE REFORMATION, IN DANIEL'S AND IN THE APOCALYPTIC PROPHECIES.

"And the Angel, which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the land, lifted up his hand to heaven, and swore by Him that liveth for ever and ever, who created the heaven and the things that therein are, and the earth and the things that therein are, and the sea and the things which are therein, that the time shall not yet be:² but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, whensoever he may be about to sound,³ then the mystery of God shall be finished;⁴ according to the glad tidings that He hath declared⁵ to his servants the prophets." Apoc. x. 5—7.

In the two preceding and primary acts of this vision of the self-revealing rainbow-circled Covenant-Angel, and its recorded accompaniments and consequents on the Apocalyptic scene, we traced in our former Chapter a

two examples; the first that of the *opening æra of Christianity*, the second this of the *Reformation*. He adds, with reference to a yet more glorious coming exemplification, "Et il le verra en des jours futurs,"

² See the Notes on page 121 *infra*.

³ See p. 122.

⁴ See Note p. 122 *infra*.

¹ *Ibid.* ii. 178.

⁵ ὡς εὐηγγελισε τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ὄψεως τῆς προφητίας.

most accurate prefiguration of the two grand religious discoveries, made first to Luther then to others in Christendom, which introduced the great Protestant Reformation. Is it the case that the present very different but almost equally striking figuration may be historically explained on the same principle; as signifying a further revelation made, in due chronological order of sequence, to Luther and other reforming doctors, and therein a further epoch of advance and progress in the Reformation? Let us, as before, first well consider the *figuration*; then turn to *history* to enquire after the fulfilment.

I. THE PROPHECY.

Now with regard to this *prophetic passage* under consideration, it is to be premised that two important changes of translation have been made by me in it. The first is of the clause *ὅτι χρόνος ἔκ εἶσαι ἐτι* which I have rendered, in common with many other expositors, “*that the time shall not yet be;*” in place of the authorized version, “*that time shall be no longer;*”—the other of the clause *ὅταν μελλῆ σαλπιζειν* which I render, “*whenever he may be about to sound;*” instead of the authorized, “*when he shall begin to sound.*”—In the first of these changes we cannot, I think, be materially mistaken. The authorized version of it, “*there shall be time no longer,*” is one clearly inadmissible. For *χρόνος* in the abstract sense of *time*, as opposed to *eternity*, is never used in Scripture: ¹ and moreover how could it be said that time should at the sounding of the seventh Trumpet-Angel be no longer, when the mutations introduced by that Trumpet were to issue, as appears clearly from the Apocalyptic sequel, in the millennial reign of Christ;—a reign including, as its commencing term, the definite period of 1000 years of time? Another proposed translation, “*There shall be delay no more,*” appears to be possible indeed, and suitable to the context, but on grammatical grounds

¹ The word most nearly used in this sense is *αιων*. So Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49, *εν τη συντελειᾳ του αιωνος*, and elsewhere; where however it only denotes the duration of the present dispensation; the terminating point of the *αιων* being in Christ's millennial reign, and the then regeneration of all things.

scarcely so probable as that given by me: ¹ and a third too has been proposed, *A time shall not yet be*, in the mystical prophetic sense of a *time*, which is also possible, though I think objectionable.² As to that which I have adopted, while there seems to be no valid grammatical objection to it, it will be found both to suit the context, and to be in the present case substantially the same in *sense* with the former of the rival versions,³ and *historically considered* hardly inconsistent with the other.

¹ Though *χρονίζω*, the *verb*, mean to delay, and *χρονος* with verbs like *ποιῶ* be used sometimes in the same * sense, yet where is there example of *χρονος* with the substantive verb meaning delay?

² This *third* version is that of Messrs. Birks and Bickersteth: who, construing *χρονος* as a *year*, would explain it in a mystical sense, on the *year-day* system, as 360 years. But although the word *χρονος* is sometimes used for a *year*, † it is *never* used to express the prophetic mystical period *time, times, and half a time*, either in the Septuagint translation of Daniel, (a prophet and prophecy here evidently referred to,) or in the Apocalypse: in these cases the word used is always and distinctively *καιρος*. Mr. Birks does not appear to me to have advanced a step towards removing the gravity of this objection. (See his *Prophetic Elements* pp. 385—388).

³ The only debateable objection is grounded on the absence of the definite article before *χρονος*. But, if I mistake not, the circumstance of the verb of the sentence being the *substantive* verb will account for it. For this is one of the rules laid down by Bishop Middleton; (On the Greek Article, Part I. ch. iii. § 3, p. 60;)—that where the *copula*, or verb connecting the *subject* and the *predicate*, is the *verb substantive*, there the article is omitted. His rule is derived from the *implication of existence* in the definite article, considered in its original character as a demonstrative pronoun. What need then of *it*, he argues, where the *verb* is one merely affirming or denying existence? “To affirm the existence of that of which the existence is already assumed would be superfluous; to deny it would be contradictory and absurd.” He illustrates, among other examples, from Acts xxiii. 5; “I knew not *ὅτι εἰν ἀρχιερεὺς*,” rightly rendered, he says, “Ananias is the high priest.”—To which let me add two or three other examples, more exactly parallel with the clause under discussion, from their involving nouns of *time*: e. g. John v. 9, *ἦν δὲ σαββατὸν* “it was *the* sabbath;” whereas with other verbs *σαββατὸν* in the same sense has the definite article attached: again John xix. 14; *ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα* “it was *the* preparation of the passover:” and Mark xi. 13; *οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς συγκῶν* “it was not *the* time of fig-gathering.” Yet once more we read in John v. 1, *Μετὰ ταῦτα ἦν εορτὴ τῶν Ἰσθαιῶν* on which passage a question of importance, from its bearing on the chronology of Christ's life, has arisen; viz. whether the feast spoken of be *the* Feast κατ' ἐξοχὴν, i. e. the Feast of the Passover, or it be simply *a* Feast. Bishop Middleton argues that the absence of the article offers no objection to the κατ' ἐξοχὴν meaning; because, as in the other examples, of the verb being the verb substantive. He observes also that the addition of the words *μετὰ ταῦτα* to the verb of

* So Demosthenes, *χρονος ἐμποιοῖεν τοῖς πρῶγμασι*, *moram negotiis exhibere*. Compare Daniel ii. 16; *Ἡξίωσε τὸν βασιλεῖα ὅτι χρόνον δὴ αὐτῶ;* and Apoc. ii. 21; *Ἐδῶκα αὐτῆ χρόνον*.

† So, for example, Thucydides, i. 30; *Τῶ τε χρόνῳ τῶ πλείσθι μετὰ τὴν ναυμαχίαν ἐπεκρατῆν τῆς θαλάσσης* rendered by Duker, “*maximâ ejus anni parte*.” Also Diodorus Sic. *Ἡ ὀλυμπίας πληρῆται κατὰ τετταράς χρόνους*. And so Phavorinus in his Lexicon; *Χρόνος καλεῖται ἢ τε ἥλιος κινήσις ἀπο τοῦ αὐτῆ εἰς τὸ αὐτο, καὶ ἐνιαυτός, καὶ ἐτος*. See too Suicer on the word.

With regard to the *latter* clause amended, I scarcely need suggest to the classical reader that *ὅταν μελλῆ σαλπίζειν* cannot mean, “when he *shall begin* to sound.” My version, “whenever he *may be about* to sound,” is but its literal rendering. And forasmuch as the event spoken of as to take place, viz, the ending or completion of God’s mystery, is referred not to the time *just before* the seventh angel’s sounding, but to *the days subsequently following on* the sounding,¹—I therefore propose to construe the clause in question *parenthetically*, thus; “But in the days of the seventh angel, (whenever he may be about to sound,) then the mystery of God shall be finished.” Thus all will harmonize:—by the parenthetic words a certain dubiousness only being made to attach to the time of the seventh Angel’s sounding, and its results, though an event apparently not very distant.

This seems all that is necessary in the way of *critical* remark on the passage; Bishop Middleton having long since sufficiently explained and justified the authorized rendering of *καὶ ἐτελεσθη*.² I therefore now pass to the figuration itself.

existence does not preclude the application of the principle; because it was not the *principal* purpose of the writer to affirm that the festival was *after*, rather than *before*, the events previously recorded.—The same may be said, I conceive, of the *εἰ* added in the present instance. The time’s *not being yet* was not that on which the main point and force of the Angel’s oath insisted; but rather the certainty of its being in the days of the seventh Angel, whenever his time of sounding.

¹ *Ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς φωνῆς τῆς ἑβδομῆς ἀγγέλου, ὅταν μελλῆ σαλπίζειν.* Compare the Septuagint Version of Jer. xxix. 10; (numbered xxxvi. 10 in the Septuagint;) ‘Ὅταν μελλῆ πληρῶσθαι Βαβυλῶν ἑβδομηκοντα εἴη ἐπισκεψομαι ὑμᾶς’ where it is evident, alike from the Hebrew original, and from the necessary sense of the passage, that the time designated of God’s visitation of captive Judah is that *following on*, not that *just preceding*, the *fulfilment* of the seventy years.

² It is to be observed that there is another reading of this clause, *καὶ τελεσθη*, in the aorist subjunctive. If this be adopted, as it has been by Mill, there will be nothing remarkable in the construction: the *ὅταν* governing the *τελεσθη*, as well as the *μελλῆ*; and the point of affirmation,—as inferred from the preceding assertion, “The time shall *not yet* be,”—being its contrary, “But the time *shall be* whenever the seventh angel may sound, and the mystery of God shall have been finished.”—The reading however which has the best authority for it, and which is adopted by Griesbach, is that given above, *καὶ ἐτελεσθη*, in the aorist indicative. Receiving this, the following is Bishop Middleton’s very happy suggestion for its solution. He explains it as a *Hebraism*; the Hebrew idiom giving a future signification to a præterite following on a future, which has the *Vau converse* to connect them. He illustrates from Judges iv. 8, “If thou wilt go with me, *then will I go*,” the Hebrew being *וְאִלְכֶנָּה*,—literally “and I went.” So

And need I call attention to the exceeding impressiveness of the act and words figured? Who could witness, who hear or read them, and not thrill under the impression? Consider the *announcement*! It told of no less an event than the certain approach and nearness, at the distance of but one more grand prophetic epoch, of the long-promised consummation. And what that consummation? The ending of what is emphatically called *God's mystery*: his mystery of *Providence*, wherein good has so long been overborne by evil, the saints by the world, Christ by Antichrist:—his mystery too, his chiefest mystery, of *prophecy*; ¹ which in darkly expressed figures, and enigmatic chronological periods, (of which more presently,) enwrap long since each prediction of the *time* of the Providential mystery ending; and of the which, until the eve of the consummation, it seemed that the church would from age to age in vain seek a complete solution.—Consider too the *Person* announcing it; the same divine Covenant-Angel, Jehovah Jesus, that now brought with him, as his own proper investiture, the same glory as the God-man in Daniel's earlier vision.²—And, once more, the exceedingly solemn *adjuration* which confirmed it; “He lifted up his hand to heaven, and swore by Him that liveth for ever and ever, who created the heaven and the things that therein are, and the earth and the things that therein are, and the sea and the things that are therein:”—an oath of which the *form*, by lifting up his hand to heaven, appears from other Scripture to have been that which was adopted as most solemn not by man only,³ but God;⁴ and in which *God himself*

that the construction of the passage will be this; “In the days of the seventh angel, whensoever he may be about to sound, the mystery of God *shall be finished*:”—the *και ετελεσθη* being by Bishop Middleton's rule tantamount to *τελεσθησεται*.—In the *Critici Sacri* the same explanation is given as from Piscator.

¹ The same word *μυστηριον* is used in Dan. ii. 18 of the mystery of Nebuchadnezzar's dream and symbolic image: also ib. 22 of all such prophetic mysteries generally. ² Dan. xii. 7.

³ So Gen. xiv. 22; “And Abram said, I have lifted up mine hand unto the Lord, the most High God, the possessor of heaven and earth, that I will not take anything,” &c.

⁴ So in the passage from Dan. xii. 7, quoted in the text presently after; and again in Deut. xxxii. 40; “For I lift up my hand to heaven, and say, I live for ever.”

was invoked as witness to its truth.—It is observable that the attributes of Jehovah specially mentioned in the oath, and thereby pledged to its truth, were precisely those of which we can ourselves discern the admirable appropriateness. As the *ever-living and unchangeable One*, it must needs be that He would both foresee the coming future, without possibility of error, and would also carry on His designs without shadow of turning. As *Creator of the world*, He could not but have formed it with a view to the establishment of his own purposes, reign, and glory; and moreover could not but have power also over all, to accomplish that intended and blessed object.—Nor should there be overlooked the circumstance of the appeal from the Divine Covenant-Angel to the Divine Creator and Eternal One, being in fact an appeal to *Himself*. But this was no strange thing. The example cited by the apostle, and his comment on it in the Epistle to the Hebrews, will suffice to satisfy us of its accordance with Scripture usage. “Because He could swear by no greater, He *swore by Himself*; that by two immutable things,” (his promise and his oath,) “in which it was impossible for God to lie, they might have a strong consolation who have fled to lay hold on the hope set before them.”¹—*That they might have a strong consolation* who have fled to Jesus! Such was God’s great object in the oath St. Paul speaks of. Was it not that also of the Angel’s here heard by St. John?

Besides all which, it is most important (as will soon appear on our entering on the history) that we mark the parallelism of the act and oath, with that other just alluded to in Daniel; a parallelism so striking that it seems incredible but that the allusion to it must have been meant, and one imprest on the mind of St. John. The passage occurs nearly at the end of his prophecy. “I heard,” says Daniel, “the Man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when He held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven; and He swore

¹ Hebr. vi. 18.

by Him that liveth for ever and ever, that it shall be for a *time, times, and an half time*: and when He shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished.”¹ Here, besides the obvious similarity in respect of the *terms* and *manner* of the oath, as lifting up his hand to heaven, and swearing by Him that liveth for ever, it is evident from the context that He who used it was the Angel Jehovah, just as in the Apocalyptic vision under consideration.²—Further his *position*, as standing upon the waters of the Hiddekel or Tigris,—that representative and chief river of Persia,³ the then dominant one of the four great empires of prophecy,—corresponds with the Angel's standing upon land and sea in the Apocalyptic vision, and similarly intimates his being HE to whom belonged the empire of the earth, and who would in due time vindicate it to Himself.—Yet again the *consummation* referred to in Daniel may be inferred, not otherwise only, but from the Apocalyptic Angel's express reference to *the ancient prophets*, to be one and the same with that meant in the Apocalypse.⁴—But amidst all these marked points of correspondence in the two cases, there was one point as marked of difference. Whereas to Daniel the vision was declared to be one

¹ Rather *fulfilled, accomplished*.

² On his first appearance to Daniel, he is thus described, “As I was by the side of the great river Hiddekel, I lifted up my eyes, and looked. And behold a certain man clothed with linen, whose loins were girded with fine gold of Uphaz! His body also was like the beryl, and his face as the appearance of lightning, and his eyes as lamps of fire, and his feet like in color to fine brass, and the voice of his words as the voice of a multitude.” Dan. x. 5. Comparing this with the description of Christ in the 1st of the Apocalypse, the correspondence seems such as almost necessarily to involve identity. Of which identity all that follows is confirmatory.

³ So as the Euphrates was symbolic of Assyria or Babylon.

⁴ In Daniel this is described as characterized by the intervention of Michael for his people, and the waking up of the saints from the dust of the earth, to take the kingdom with Him, and to shine therein even as the sun in the firmament:—a point of no little value, as it strikes my own mind, towards the elucidation of a question of surpassing interest, in the Apocalyptic as well as in other prophecy. For “Michael the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people,” can scarcely be understood of any but Christ: especially associated as his intervention is, after a certain time of tribulation, with the resurrection of the saints.

Compare this with what is said in the heavenly song at the blast of the seventh Trumpet, Apoc. xi. 18; “And the time of the dead to be judged, and to give reward to his servants, &c.”—We shall hereafter have to enter fully on the subject.

of *many days*,¹ and the appointed time of the end to be not until after the lapse of an enigmatic period,—a *time, times, and half a time*,² measured from the epoch of some notable but darkly-hinted erection of the abomination in the holy place,³—it was here on the other hand declared to be approaching, and comparatively nigh at hand. It would not indeed, the Angel swore, be *just as yet*. But He swore also that there should intervene but one more Trumpet-sounding before it. “In the days of the seventh Angel, (whenever he may be about to sound,) then the mystery of God *shall* be finished, according to the glad tidings that He hath declared to his servants the prophets.”—Oh, how heart-cheering to St. John, as well as how solemn, this peculiarity in the revelation made to him, as compared with that to Daniel! How joyous this striking, as it were, of the hour on the chronometer of heaven, to tell that the mystery was indeed near its ending, the grand the long-desired consummation at length drawing nigh!

But this directs us at once to our next Head; on,

IIIndly, THE HISTORICAL FULFILMENT.

For here, as elsewhere, St. John is to be considered not so much in his *personal*, as in his *symbolic representative* character. Whence the inference follows that there ought to have been some impression on the mind of Luther and other Fathers of the Reformation, whom the Apostle now represented, correspondent at the time, in real historical fact, with that figured in the drama, as it was impressed on the ear and mind of the Evangelist. Already examples have occurred of certain solemn *chronological* notices, declared on the open Apocalyptic scene, having had their fulfilment in history, just as well as other prefigurations. Thus under the fifth Seal, the intimation heard given to the souls beneath the altar of there being another set of martyrs to be slain even as they, before

¹ Dan. x. 14.

² Dan. xii. 7.

³ Dan. xii. 11.—In the 6th or last part of my Work this whole concluding Prophecy of Daniel will come under examination.

the consummation, was shown to have had that which exactly answered to it, in the universally received conviction among the sufferers under Pagan Rome's oppression, of Antichrist's reign, persecution of the saints, and slaying of other martyrs, having alone to intervene before the end.¹ Again, in the case of the Angel flying through mid-heaven before the fifth Trumpet's sounding, with the denunciation of, "Woe, woe, woe to the inhabitants of the earth, by reason of the remaining trumpet-voices of the three angels that have yet to sound," we saw reason to suppose a pre-intimation of certain strong and general portendings of the world's end, and woes and trials with it, being close at hand, prevalent after the ruin of the old Roman empire.² Hence the rather a conviction that in this the most emphatic, as well as most striking, of all the Apocalyptic chronological notices, there must have been intended the prefiguration of some proportionally strong and definite expectation of the consummation, impressed in its due order of time on the minds of the Reforming fathers:—impressed upon them *in that view of the coming consummation, and as grounded on that prophetic evidence, and connected with those associations*, which struck upon St. John's ear and mind in the Angel's oath:—impressed too not as an evanescent though momentarily strong idea, (in which case it would have been no subject for *such* a symbolization,) but abidingly; as abidingly perhaps from the time of its first communication to the Reformers, at an epoch following soon after that last described, and as influentially in its measure, as the other two ideas previously impressed on their minds, of the grace of Christ and the imposture of Antichrist.—Was this then the case?

I said, *in that view of the consummation which the Angel's oath signified*. And before reverting, for an answer to my question, to the history of Luther and the Reformation, I wish to premise a word in illustration of my meaning. And this I may perhaps do best by suggesting,

¹ See Vol. i. 196—204.

² See Vol. i. p. 359, &c.

in contrasted view, that expectation and fermenting of the public mind of Christendom, with reference to the coming future, which was manifested, it will be remembered, already before the commencement of the Reformation, and when the name of Luther had scarce been heard beyond his own monastery. From the unprecedented burst of literature and intellect which had followed on the invention of printing, from the discovery of a new world, and from the introduction into it of the Christian arms and Christian faith,—from these and other considerations the æra had struck the minds of men as one very remarkable and extraordinary: and new and indefinite prospects opened before them in the misty future, to which imagination, according to the genius and character of the contemplatist, gave of course a somewhat various colouring. But alike in other European countries, and above all in Italy, the centre of the literature as well as religion of Europe, this was observable,—that excepting a very few like Savanarola who spoke of the nearness of Christ's coming to take the kingdom, the expectations prevalent were all of courtly theory, and in harmony with the established *anti-christian* superstition. The anticipations prevalent were anticipations of the imminent fulfilment of the promised latter-day glory, *in the POPE'S universally extending empire*. It was an idea, we saw, expressed alike vividly by the painters, poets, and orators of the day; not the least by the preachers of the great Council General of Western Christendom, assembled at Rome in solemn conclave, just about the time of Leo the Xth's elevation to the popedom.¹ And, as if in order that no gloomy counter-views might cross and interrupt these glowing anticipations, the subjects of *Antichrist* and *the judgment*, it appeared, were declared forbidden subjects.²

• But the prophecies of Daniel, and that too of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, (which latter seemed also by implication referred to in the Angel's oath,)³ exhibited the

¹ See the Chapter next but one before this.

² See p. 82 *suprà*.

³ St. Paul's words (2 Thess. ii. 4) "Him that exalteth himself above all that

coming future in altogether a different aspect :—the object *there* set forth as to be looked and hoped for being the kingdom of *Christ*, not that of the *Popes of Rome* ;¹ and its establishment as not to be effected, except after the previous tremendous destruction, before the brightness of his coming, of that same Papal Antichrist, with his abomination in the Holy Place,² that same Man of Sin and his apostacy,³ from off the face of the earth.—Can the imagination of man conceive a greater contrast ?

Now after the Reformers' discovery of the Popes being the Antichrist of prophecy, and the marvellous events consequent thereon, it is easy to see how all this might follow naturally as a sequel. For the same prophecies that foretold Antichrist's *character* and *doings*, had spoken too of *his days as numbered*, and *his destruction certain* : and moreover had specified the *manner* and the *means* of his destruction ; how it should be as it were, without hand of man, by *the breath of the Lord's mouth*, as well as brightness of his coming !⁴ What more natural then than that when within three or four years the Bible had been drawn from its long concealment, and its prerogative as the sole rule of faith vindicated, when the gospel of the grace of Jesus had been revealed again in its divine beauty, and the shadows of Papal superstition in not a few districts fled before it, when a public exposure too had been made of Popery, and the exposure believed and repeated by multitudes, —what more natural, I say, than that these circumstances should be regarded as the incipient fulfilment of those prophecies of the fall of Antichrist, and sign of the promised brighter day soon coming ? Accordingly so in fact it occurred. Not on Luther's mind only, but, as we shall presently see, on that of the whole reforming body, this idea now fixed itself, somewhat like the two earlier heaven-revealed ideas spoken of in the preceding Chapter, with all the

is called God, and is worshipped," are generally, and I think justly, regarded by expositors as adopted from Daniel xi. 36. See my Comment on it, in Vol. iii.

¹ Mark here the natural sequence of this view of the latter-day promises, from that noted in Vol. i. p. 238.

² Dan. xii. 11.

³ 2 Thess. ii. 3.

⁴ Dan. ii. 34, 2 Thess. ii. 8.

unction and influentiality of a voice from the Spirit of Jesus ; alike in Germany, in Switzerland, and in England. But with this peculiarity and difference, between the Reformers in the three countries respectively,—that whereas Luther, and his fellow-working *German* Reformers, grounded their strong and hopeful impressions chiefly, (though not wholly) on *Daniel's* and *St. Paul's* prophecies,¹ referred to in the Angel's oath,—those in *Switzerland* and *England* soon passed from the prophecies alluded to, to that of the Apocalyptic Angel himself alluding ; seized on this very prophecy for application ; and for the first time, on grounds of evidence sound and tenable, concluded on the fact of progress having been made up to it, in the evolution of the great mundane drama, and on their own chronological place being precisely under the sixth, and in expectancy of the seventh Trumpet, of the Apocalyptic prophecy. I proceed to give illustrations in evidence.

1. And first I exemplify from *Luther* and his *German* coadjutors.—Already then, ere the close of 1520, and consequently just after his discovery of the true Antichrist, we find him in his answer to the Pope's condemnatory Bull thus expressing his anticipations, with special reference to the prophecy of the Apostle *Paul*: “ Our Lord Jesus Christ yet liveth and reigneth : who, I firmly trust, will shortly come ; and slay with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming, that Man of Sin.”²—A month or two afterwards, when, on his being summoned before the Emperor at Worms, there were some that dissuaded his attending, from recollection of the treachery practised on a similar occasion against Huss and Jerome, his

¹ Luther at the time of his first translation of the New Testament A. D. 1522 had doubts about the genuineness of the Apocalypse ; doubts excited in part by the hesitation of certain of the ancients to receive it, (the same that I have spoken of in my Preliminary Essay,) in part by the obscurity of the Prophecy ; and so express himself in the Preface to that Book in his first edition of the German Testament. In the second edition, published A. D. 1534, he greatly modified this opinion ; and afterwards received and referred to it, as an inspired though obscure prophecy.

² Merle D'Aub. ii. 166 : “ Ostendat illum diem adventûs gloriæ Filii sui, quo destruat iniquus iste.”

reply was, "that fear in his case would be only a suggestion of Satan; who was apprehending defeat, and the approaching ruin of his kingdom."¹ Still, on leaving the Diet, and after condemnation had been pronounced against him by the Emperor, he fell back for comfort on the same joyous expectation. "For this once," he said, "the Jews" (as on the crucifixion day) "may sing their Pæan: but Easter will come for us, and then we shall sing Hallelujah!"² The next year again, writing to Staupitz, he enforced a solemn appeal against his abandonment of the Reformation, by reference to the sure and advancing fulfilment of *Daniel's* prophecy in the events in progress: "My father, the abominations of the Pope, with his whole kingdom, must be destroyed; and the Lord does this without hand, by the word alone. The subject exceeds all human comprehension. I cherish the best hopes."³ In 1523 he thus in similar strain expressed his hopes. "The kingdom of Antichrist, according to the Prophet *Daniel*, must be broken *without hand*: that is, the scriptures will be understood by and by;⁴ and every one will preach and speak against Papal tyranny from the word of God, until the Man of Sin" (here his allusion is again to *St. Paul's* prophecy) "is deserted by all his adherents, and dies of himself:"⁵—and again to the Duke of Savoy, on hearing of his favourable inclination to the Reformation; "Let there be no compulsion: only let those who sincerely preach the Gospel be protected and known to be in no danger: this is the way in which Christ will destroy Antichrist by the breath of his mouth; and thus, as it is in *Daniel*, he shall be broken without hand;—he whose coming is with lying wonders."⁶ Once more,

¹ Milner 750.

² Merle D'Aub. ii. 275.—It appears from his Table Talk, chap. lvii, that he had in later life at least, and consequently perhaps earlier, an impression that Christ's second coming would be at *Easter*. "About the time of Easter Pharaoh was destroyed in the Red Sea, and Israel led out of Egypt: about the same time the world was created, Christ arose again, and the world is renewed. Even so, I am of opinion, the last day shall come about Easter, when the year is at its finest and fairest."

³ Milner 692.

⁴ "The time shall not yet be."

⁵ Milner 796.

⁶ Ib. 826.

on hearing still in the same year of the condemnation and martyrdom of some of his followers in Flanders,—the first blood shed in that country in the cause of the Reformation,—he thus comforts himself; “But the Judge is at the door, and will soon pronounce a different sentence.”¹

So in earlier days the Reformer *Luther*. Nor did the circumstance of the *fanatics* of the day adopting, and making unsound and unscriptural use of, this expectation of the near advent of Christ,² affect his belief in or declaration of it: for it seemed but Satan’s well known artifice, by abuse or by a counterfeit, to bring contempt on what was important and true. Rather, though it made him cautious and jealous afterwards of the unguarded use of prophecy,³ yet he regarded it as an additional mark of the last day being at hand; Satan perceiving the fact and putting forth his final fury.⁴—Nor indeed did *the idea* ever leave him. Still resting mainly and strongly on that prophecy in Daniel xi and xii respecting the apostate King the Pope, and his abomination making desolate,⁵ as that which Christ himself (*the Apocalyptic Covenant-Angel of the vision before us*) had most solemnly called attention to,⁶ and which St. Paul had both

¹ Milner 816.

² Such was the case in 1522 with the Anabaptists under Munzer.—Again in 1528 the Duke George wrote thus of the state of things in Thuringia; “that the common people there were expecting their real Lord and Master to appear shortly, in defence of his own word and gospel: and every where it was the cry of these enthusiastic visionaries, No tribute! All things in common! No tithes! No Magistrates! The kingdom is at hand.”—Milner 939; who observes, however, that probably among this multitude there were not a few sincerely pious, though unlearned and simple, led away by the more artful and fanatic.

³ Seckendorf mentions (Lib. ii. p. 113) that in 1528 Luther blamed those who (incompetent as they evidently were to the task) expounded the Apocalypse in public lectures. He had said the same about expositions of Zechariah.

⁴ “I have a new species of fanatics from Antwerp, who assert that the Holy Spirit is nothing more than men’s natural reason and understanding. How does Satan rage every where against the word! This I reckon by no means the slightest mark of the approaching end, viz. that Satan perceives that the day is at hand, and pours forth his final fury.” This was in 1525. Of course his remarks embraced other outbreaks of fanaticism, such as that previously under Munzer. Milner, 896.

⁵ This application of Daniel’s words to the abominations of Popery will be illustrated and justified in the comment on Dan. xi, xii, in my Part vi.

⁶ “Daniel was an exceeding high and excelling prophet, touching whom Christ said ‘Whoso readeth, let him mark!’ Read Dan. xi throughout.” Table Talk,

copied after and illustrated,¹ he gathered, as life advanced, that still some few things remained to be fulfilled ere the glorious consummation;—some further consumption and wasting of the Popedom through the gospel-word,² or perhaps some temporary apostacy of the Protestant body, and consequent brief revival of the Papal power,³ perhaps too some confederation of Pope and Turk against Christ's Protestant faithful ones:⁴—else the world's wickedness marked it as even then fully ripe.⁵ Thus though God's mystery of the prophetic numbers, *the time*

chap. xxiii. on Antichrist. And again; "Truly the Pope's kingdom is an abomination of desolation, standing in the Holy Place; as Christ saith, 'Whoso readeth let him understand.'" Ibid.

¹ "St. Paul read Daniel thoroughly, and useth also his words where he saith, 'And he will exalt himself above all that is called god, or is worshipped.'" Ib. chap. xxii.

² "The Pope is the last blaze in the lamp, which will go out, and ere long be extinguished. He lightens and thunders with sword and bull; but the Spirit of God's mouth, hath seized on him."—"I hope he hath done his worst; and though he falleth not altogether, yet he shall increase no more, but rather decrease." Ib. chap. xxiii.

³ "Seeing this abomination (of the Papacy) is now showed in God's word, and found out by experience through our wicked lives, such thoughts do arise in me as willingly I would not have; viz. that this acknowledgment of the Word will fall again, and the bright shining light of the Gospel be extinguished. For, we know, Christ will come at midnight, when neither day nor light will appear." Ib. chap. xxiii.—Again: "I am not so much afraid of the Pope and tyrants, as of our own unthankfulness and contemning of God's word:—the same, I fear, will help the Pope again into the saddle. When that comes to pass, I hope the day of judgment will soon follow." Ib. chap. iv, on the World.—Elsewhere he predicted a defection in the Protestant body from the right faith after the death of himself and Melancthon; somewhat as in Israel, after the death of the elders that overlived Joshua. E. g. in same chap. iv; "I much fear there will come an horrible falling away after my departure." And so too in Aurifer's Preface.

⁴ "It is now time to watch; for we are the mark they shoot at. Our adversaries intend to make a confederacy with the Turk: for Antichrist will war and get victory against the saints of God, as Daniel saith." Ib. ch. xv, on Prayer. Elsewhere he intimates an idea that the Turk might perhaps come to Rome, in this confederation, and there pitch the tabernacles of his palace on the (professedly) Holy Mount.

⁵ "When people live securely without the fear of God, and blaspheme Christ, and persecute his word, as now the Papists &c. do, and with great rage banish and murder godly people, as if heretics, then surely the end cannot be far off. So it went with the Jews when they blasphemed Christ:—when the Lord had gathered the wheat into his garner, then he set the chaff on fire." Ib. ch. vii, on Christ."—Again; "The world is grown very stubborn and headstrong since the revealing of the word of the gospel: it begins to crack sorely; and I hope will soon break, and fall on a heap, through the coming of the day of judgment, for which we wait with yearning and sighs of heart. Thy kingdom come!" Ib. ch. iv.

Similarly in 1543 he wrote thus. "The world is, as it ever has been, the world; and desires to know nothing of Christ. Let it go its own way. They continue to rage and grow worse from day to day: which indeed is a solace to the weary soul, as it shows that the glorious day of the Lord is at hand. For the unspeakable contempt of the world, and unutterable lamentations of godly

times and half a time, baffled him by its obscurity, and at one time, in his conjectures about the destined epoch of the consummation, he fancied it might be less than twenty years off,¹ at another deprecated the extension of the interval to fifty years,² and at another mentioned 300 as the furthest limit that entered his imagination,³—yet the prevalent idea of its being near at hand remained with him even to his dying hour,⁴ and was a perpetual topic of consolation, encouragement, and hope.

Very similar were the views of the other great German Reformer *Melancthon*.—Like Luther he intently fixed his mind on Daniel's prophecies of Antichrist, and St. Paul's subsequent prophecy and almost comment thereupon, as Christ's own positive direction and charge.⁵ Like Luther he undoubtingly explained the wilful or apos-

men, show that the world is given up to its own ways; that the day of its destruction, and of our salvation, should be hastened. Amen! so be it!"

¹ After saying, "I cannot define this prophecy, *A time, times, and half a time*," he throws out the idea (a fanciful one) that possibly its secondary application to *Antichrist* (the primary being to *Antiochus Epiphanes*) might be on the scale of *a time* equalling the *thirty years* of our Lord's life; in which case three and a half times would equal 105 years, and reckoned from the taking of Constantinople (the Turk being the *Eastern Antichrist*) end at A. D. 1558. "God knoweth." Ib. ch. xxiii.—Another idea he threw out was that perhaps the Apocalyptic number of the Beast 666 might mean the number of years of established Papal power; which, measured from the time of Charlemagne, would come nearly down to the Reformation.

² Near the time of his death he said; "God forbid the world should last 50 years longer. Let him cut matters short with his last judgment." Table Table, Michelet ii. 216. This was said in grief at the unfaithfulness of many Protestants.

³ "The wickedness of the world is risen to that height that I dare presume to say the world cannot continue many hundred years longer." Ib. ch. ix. on *Sims*. And chap. i: "I persuade myself verily that the day of judgment will not be absent full 300 years more. God will not, cannot suffer this wicked world much longer."

⁴ Seckendorf, Lib. iii, p. 640: "Deus, Pater cælestis, postquam mihi, secundum magnam misericordiam tuam, apostasiam, cœcitatem, et tenebras Pape, ante dicm tuum extremum,—*qui non procul abest, sed imminet*, et lucem Evangelicam quæ nunc per orbem effulsit secuturus est,—revelasti," &c. These were words in his prayer the evening before his death. They illustrate the subjects of the preceding chapter, as well as of this.

From Junckner's *Vita Lutheri Nummis Illustrata*, I add the following further illustrations. 1. At p. 24 there occurs a medal with Luther's bust on the obverse, and the legend *Tertius Elias*; on the reverse an Angel flying with the everlasting Gospel in his hand, and the legend, *Cecidit Cecidit Babylon*. 2. At p. 234 a German medal of 1546 is given, representing Christ as come down to judgment, and the dead rising, with the legend, "Watch, for ye know not at what hour the Lord cometh." It was struck just after Luther's death; and shows, says Junckner, the then general apprehension among Protestants of the judgment day being at hand.

⁵ In the general Preface to his comment on Daniel, he quotes the passage, "Let him that readeth &c., understand."

tate King of Dan. xi, in respect of both his abomination making desolate, his pride, tyranny, and fated end,¹ (not to add the little horn of Dan. viii also,²) to mean the Popes and Popedom. Like Luther he judged that fated end to be near and imminent. On the mystically expressed periods that fixed the chronology of that ending, he could but indeed conjecture. But in commenting on the passage that contains the oath involving them, of the man that stood clothed in linen upon the waters of the river, after strongly insisting on the predicted fact of there rising up no *fifth earthly universal empire*, after the Roman in its last form under the little horn, but only the kingdom of Christ and his saints,³ he thus adverts to that same chronological argument, by way of corroboration, that had been used long before him, as we have seen, by the early Christians;⁴ I mean the argument from the seven days of creation. "The words of the prophet Elias should be marked by every one, and inscribed upon our walls, and on the entrances of our houses. Six thousand years shall this world stand, and after that be destroyed: 2000 years without the law; 2000 years under the law of Moses; 2000 years under the Messiah: and if any of these years are not fulfilled, they will be shortened (a shortening intimated by Christ also⁵) on account of our sins." Dr. Cox, after quoting the above from Melancthon's Commentary, gives the following manuscript addition, that he had found in Melancthon's hand in Luther's own copy of the German Bible: "Written A. D. 1557, and from the Creation of the World 5519: from which number we may see that this aged world is not far from its end."⁶—With this calculation he con-

¹ In his comment on Dan. xi. he expounds the verses respecting the abomination of desolation primarily of Antiochus Epiphanes, but secondarily and chiefly of Antichrist.

² The little horn in Dan. viii he judged to be the Papacy, that in Dan. vii to be Mahomedanism; an order which I conceive should be inverted.

³ When the little horn "jam pœne ad fastigium suum venerit, necesse est brevi ruiturum esse; ac tunc illucescet dies ille quo mortui revocabuntur ad vitam."

⁴ See Vol. i. pp. 202, 366.

⁵ "Et dictum Elæ, et Christi dicta, significant decurtandum esse hoc tempus, sicut et curriculum ad diluvium decurtabatur, ut citius abrumpantur flagitia."

⁶ See his Life of Melancthon.

ceived that Daniel's numbers 1260 days and 1335 days might on the *year-day* system be made well to coincide.¹ At any rate he felt persuaded, alike from Daniel and St. Paul, that the reformation and protest against the Papal Antichrist, just accomplished through the light of the Gospel, was the consumption and conviction of that enemy predicted as to occur, just before his final destruction at Christ's coming.² And upon this prophecy and prospect it became christians, he thought, much and earnestly to dwell, alike for consolation, direction, and warning, till that glorious day should itself burst upon them.³

¹ While primarily applicable to the history of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees, he adds, "Haud dubiè aliquid significat etiam de fine hujus mundi : — Ac facilis est accomodatio *si dies in annos commutaveris.*" His suggestion is that the 1260 and 1335 years added together might mark the interval between Daniel and the consummation ; a computation well agreeing with that from Elias' tradition : — the division of the whole period into two having this meaning, that it would be some 1260 years from Daniel to the early development and "initia postremi regni impii Mahometici et hypocritici," i. e. of Mahommedism in the East and Popery in the West ; and the 1335 showing the "curriculum regni impii" (except in so far as it might be cut short) "usque ad finem mundi."

² On Dan. ii. he explains the *stone cut out of the mountain without hands*, which was to smite the image, and become a great mountain, and fill the whole earth, to mean *Christ*, whose kingdom was to be formed not by human counsel ; being a spiritual kingdom, formed through the *word*. Then he adds how God's word "*primum arguet prædicatione, postea evertet et afficiet hostes æternis pænis.*" — Again on Dan. viii, and the expression about the little horn being broken *without hand*, he observes : "Significat ante extremum judicium venturam renovationem evangelii, in qua auctoritas Pontificum labefactabitur sine armis ; hoc est docendo reprehendentur errores Pontificii, renovata luce evangelii. Sicut et Dan. xi. 33, 'Docti in populo docebunt multos, et ruent in gladio : ' et ad Thessal. ii. ; 'Quem destruct Dominus spiritu oris sui : ' nam quedam reprehensio errorum Antichristi præcedet extremum judicium, sicut Aurora solem præcedit. Porro satis perspicue apparet hoc vaticinium pertinere ad hanc nostram ætatem, et doctrinam hoc tempore divinitus patefactam." — And so again on Dan. xi. ad fin.

I may observe in passing that he too thought, like Luther, that the *Turk* might fulfil the prophecy of the King of the North pitching his palace in the Holy Mountain between the seas, by attacking the Protestant churches ; and that then Michael would stand up for them ; i. e. Christ come to judgment.

³ See both the preface to his Comment on Daniel, and his conclusion of the Comment. — This Comment was written A. D. 1542, and published at the beginning of 1543.

In the Augsburg Confession, the expression "*senescente mundo,*" which occurs in the article *De conjugio Sacerdotum*, shows the impression to have been generally prevalent among the German Reformers. It was drawn up by Melancthon. See *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 137.

Osiander, another of the *German Reformers*, in a work, "*De Ultimis Temporibus et Fine Mundi,*" published at Nuremberg in the year 1544, argues like Melancthon from the tradition of Elias : observing that as not all the sixth day was employed in creation, but its evening partly taken into the Sabbath, so it might be expected that all the sixth millennium would not pass before the sabbatism ; but the sabbath begin ere it had all run out. — He also somewhat curiously notes *Phocas' Decree*, A. D. 606, as constituting a notable Papal commencing epoch,

2. I turn to the *Swiss* Reformers cotemporary with Luther and Melancthon ; and first take *Leo Juda* as a specimen. In his Comment on the Apocalypse, an English translation of which bears date 1552, and which must consequently have been written and printed in the original some time previously, I find a very interesting comment on the two concluding verses of Apoc. ix ; applying the charges therein of idolatry, sorceries, fornication, murders, &c, to Rome's antichristian Church of his day, just as I have done ; and the tenth chapter also generally, as I have done, to the blessed Reformation. And then he thus further applies to his own time the Angel's oath : " Christ taketh an oath, and sweareth by God his heavenly Father, even with great fervencie and holines, that the tyme of his glorious last comming to judge al the world, both quicke and dead, is now already nigh and at hand : and that when the victory that was prophesied to be fulfilled of Antichrist, (which victory the seventh angel must blowe forth according to his office,) wer once past, then should altogether be fulfilled what al prophetes did ever prophesy of the kyngdom of Messias the Saviour : which is the highest mystery."

Again *Bullinger* (about the date 1555¹) similarly dwells on this same prophecy ; advancing yet a step further in explaining the sixth Trumpet (as Luther's comment nearly does) of " Mahometrie and wo of the Saracens and Turks : "—then applies the sins in Apoc. ix. 20, 21, to the Papists of his day :—then, that of the Angel's descent to the Reformation :—and, on Christ's oath in the passage before us, adds ; " Christ swears that there is but one Trumpet remaining : therefore let us lift up our heads, because our redemption draweth nigh." ²

from which to A. D. 1500 Christ's doctrine had been hid. The epoch is one that had been noted as remarkable by Luther also ; (Table Talk, ch. lxxiv, on the Turks :) and has been subsequently made use of, and applied, by the most eminent Apocalyptic expositors.

¹ The date is given in his Preface.

² I might add *Æcolampadius* to the list ; judging from *Joye's Exposition of Daniel*, gathered out of Melancthon, *Æcolampadius*, Pellicane, and Draconite : a book published early in Elizabeth's reign : and, like the others cited, very interesting.

3. Let us now cross the ocean-strait, and mark how in *Britain* also, that *isle of the sea* where the Angel was represented as planting his right foot, there was awakened the same joyous persuasion and hope.—My quotations in evidence shall be first from *Bishop Latimer*. In his third sermon on the Lord's Prayer he thus expresses himself. "Let us cry to God day and night, Most merciful Father, let thy kingdom come!—St. Paul saith, The Lord will not come till the *swerving from the faith* cometh; (2 Thes. ii. 3;) *which thing is already done and past*. Antichrist is already known throughout all the world. Wherefore the day is not far off."—Then, reverting to the consideration of the *age of the world*, the same as Melancthon and Osiander; "The world was ordained to endure, as all learned ones affirm, 6000 years. Now of that number there be past 5552 years. so that there is no more left but 448 years. Furthermore these days *shall be shortened* for the elects' sake. Therefore all those excellent and learned men, whom without doubt God hath sent into the world in these latter days to give the world warning," (mark here Latimer's testimony to the universality of the impression,) "do gather out of sacred Scripture that the last day cannot be far off."—Yet again, in a sermon on the second Sunday in Advent, after noticing the expected shortening of the days, he thus strongly expresses the same opinion on the nearness of the second Advent; "so that peradventure it may come in my days, old as I am, or in my childrens' days."¹

¹ And as *Latimer* so his brother *Ridley*.—"The world without doubt (this I do believe, and therefore I say it) draws towards an end." (Ridley's Lamentations.)

Let me add from *King Edward's Catechism* (published A. D. 1553) the following allusion, in very similar views and spirit, to the verse before us. "The end of the world Holy Scripture calleth *the fulfilling of the kingdom and mystery of Christ*, and the renewing of all things; as St. Peter saith, We look for a new heaven and new earth," &c. So p. 510; Parker Ed.—Again at p. 520 the prophecies and world's position under them are thus alluded to. "We see not yet all things in subjection to Christ; we see not the stone hewed off from the mountain without work of man, which all bruised and brought to nought the image which Daniel describeth; that Christ, the only rock, may obtain and possess the dominion of the whole world granted him of his Father. Antichrist is not yet slain. For this cause do we long for and pray that it may at length come to pass and be fulfilled, that Christ may reign with his saints, according to God's promises; that He

For another example I turn to *Bale*, afterwards Bishop of Ossory in the sister island: and, I find him, in that valuable and interesting work entitled *The Image of both Churches*, published in 1545, and which includes in it an Apocalyptic commentary, in sundry points applying this part of the Apocalyptic prophecy to his own times. On Apoc. x. 7, the verse before us, he explains the time then current as the sixth age of the church, and speaks of the seventh Trumpet only as to come: as also on Apoc. xi. 15, thus drawing his line between the fulfilled and unfulfilled; "Thus here we have what is done already, and what is yet to come under this *sixt* trumpet-blowyng, *whereunder we are now*: which al belongeth to the second wo."—Again on Apoc. xx. 3, after recounting a list of Christian confessors, including Luther, Cœcolampadius, Zuingle, Melancthon, Bucer, Bullinger, &c, by whom Antichrist's tyranny had been disclosed, he says; "I doubt not but within fewe dayes the breath of Christ's mouth, which is his lyving gospel, shall utterly destroye him."

Further respecting this "oath that all shall be finished in the *seventh* age of the Church," he adds, "Necessary it is that both good and badde know it: the faithful to be assartened that their finall redemption is at hande, to their consolation; the unfaithfull to have knowledge that their judgment is not farre of, that they may repent and be saved."¹—And again elsewhere: "This (the Beast's) will be the rule of this present age. No doubt of it. Unto kings hath not God given to subdue these Beastes. This is reserved to the victory of his living word. Only shall the breath of his mouth destroy them. Let the faithfull

may live and be Lord in the world, according to the decrees of the Holy Gospel.—God grant his kingdom may come, and that speedily."

Our Anglican Reformers, and those too of the continental churches, had no notion of any such spiritual millennium intervening before Christ's coming as Whitby afterwards advocated, and which has since his time been so much received.

¹ He here thus refers to, and gives his view of, the parallel passage in Daniel. "Not unlike is this oath to the other in Daniell, of time, times, and half a time. Whereof the *time* was from him (Daniel) to Christ; the *times* the ages from Christ to the seventh seale opening, or seventh trumpet blowing; the *half-time* from thenceforth: wherein the dayes shall be shortened for the chosen's sake.—When that time shall begin we know not, tyll God shall open it by his seventh Angell. Of the thing we are certaine."

believer, considering the mischief of this time, appoint himself to persecution, loss of goods, exyle, prison, sorrow, death, for the truthe's sake; thinking that his porcyon is in the lande of the lyving. For now are the perilous dayes under the voice of the *sixte trompe*: whereas under the *seventh* the carnal church shall be rejected, Antichrist overthrown, and the right Israell, tokened with fayth, peaceably restored into the possession of God."

I add but one more example, that of the martyrologist *John Foxxe*. In his *Eicasmī in Apocalypsin*, published in 1587, he explains the woe of the sixth Trumpet to be that of the *Turks*; adding that, after the Protestant restoration of gospel-preaching, figured in Apoc. x, the seventh Trumpet's sounding could not be far off. Then he dwells on this passage on which we are commenting thus: "O what an adjuration! Of the truth and certainty of which we can no more doubt, than we can of the existence of God Himself."¹ And, after arguing against the scepticism of ungodly men, on the subject of the world's ending, he urges from the Angel's oath the certainty of that end coming,² and certainty too, as appeared from the Angel's prophetic caution, (though the exact time was not to be known,) that it could not be very far off from the time then present. "Which being so, let both all pious Christians, and all the multitude of the ungodly, diligently listen to and observe what the Angel says and swears. For in the whole of scripture, I think, there is no passage more clear, none more suited to our times: none more calculated to strengthen the faith and minister consolation to the pious; and, on the other hand, to alarm the minds, and break off the attacks of the ungodly."

Thus have I shown, as I proposed, that commencing

¹ "O quale quantumque juramenti sacramentum! Cujus de fide et firmitate inevitabili tam certo nobis constare possit, quam certum sit et indubitatum Deum vivere."

² On Apoc. xi. 16 he notes, as among the results of the seventh Trumpet's sounding, *Antichrist's* being cast into the barathrum of perdition.

immediately from the time of Luther and Zuingle's first heaven-made discovery of the Antichrist of prophecy being none other than the Roman Popes, there was also impressed on them, with all the force and vividness of a heavenly communication, the conviction of the fated time being near at hand, though not indeed yet come, of Antichrist's final foredoomed destruction, and therewith also of Christ's kingdom coming, and God's great prophetic mystery ending: just agreeably in respect of time, as well as of subject-matter, with the Angel's oath heard at this epoch in the Apocalyptic drama by the representative man St. John:—further, that the impression connected itself, in the case of Luther and his brother *German* reformers, at first at least, with that *prophecy of Daniel* that was alluded to so evidently and strikingly by the Apocalyptic Angel; with the *Angel's own oath and prophecy*, in the case of the Reformers in *Switzerland* and *England*: (a view involving the great prophetic discovery of their being then under the sixth Trumpet in the evolution of the Apocalyptic drama, and the seventh only having to blow in order to the consummation:)—finally, that the impression was no mere barren piece of prophetic chronological information imparted to the Reformers, but one most influential and practical; in fact precisely that which was best suited to animate them for the great work that they had before them, both in respect of doing and of suffering, in all their subsequent conflicts, as the Lord's witnesses, with Antichrist, the world, and Satan.—Is it possible that we can help seeing and admiring God's goodness and wisdom in the matter?

In conclusion let me not pass from this subject without suggesting to the reader, that as the view thus communicated, considered as a *prophetic chronological discovery*, was all but unprecedented, it being then for the first time distinctly revealed to Christians whereabouts they were in God's grand prophetic calendar of the world's history,¹ so the idea, like those two other heaven-re-

¹ Save and except partially in the case of the Christians under Pagan Rome's persecution, of which I spoke before as also prefigured, Vol. I. pp. 202, 203.

vealed ideas about Christ and Antichrist that preceded it, established itself permanently in the mind of Protestant Christendom. Pareus, Brightman, Mede, Vitringa, and almost all the host of other principal expositors that followed on the continent and in England, kept up the idea as certain, throughout the 17th century, that the Reformation had been accomplished under the sixth Trumpet, and that the seventh only afterwards yet remained to sound. Indeed it is from this, as from a point of light, that the chief subsequent Protestant interpreters have ever since gradually, though painfully and interruptedly, made advances towards the solution of other parts of the Apocalyptic prophecy, even up to the end of the last century, and time now present.

But in this I anticipate, and must return back to Luther's history and times, whence I started. After what has been said in illustration of it, the Apocalyptic passage itself need but I think to be repeated, in order in the best way to bring back our thoughts to the crisis when first it began to have fulfilment in the impression stamped on the early German Reformers of the Papal Antichrist's term of empire being not at its beginning, not at its middle, (which might of course have been their impression,) but already far advanced towards its ending; and so to prepare us for the continuation in the next Chapter of the history of Luther and the Reformation. "And the Angel, which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the land, lifted up his hand to heaven; and sware by Him that liveth for ever and ever, who created the heaven and the things that therein are, and the earth and the things that therein are, and the sea and the things that are therein, that the time shall not yet be; but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, (whenever he may be about to sound,) then the mystery of God shall be ended; according to the glad tidings that He hath declared to his servants the prophets."

CHAPTER VI.

THE PROGRESS AND ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENT
OF THE REFORMATION.

“AND the voice which I heard from heaven spake unto me again, and said ; Go, take the little book which has been opened, in the hand of the Angel which standeth upon the sea and upon the land. And I went unto the Angel, and said to Him, Give me the little book ! And He saith unto me, Take, and eat it up : and it shall make thy belly bitter, but it shall be in thy mouth sweet as honey. And I took the little book out of the Angel’s hand, and ate it up : and it was in my mouth sweet as honey ; but when I had eaten it, my belly was bitter. And He said unto me, Thou must prophesy again before many peoples, and nations, and languages, and kings.

And there was given me a reed like unto a rod. And the Angel stood saying, Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and those that worship at it. But the court that is without the temple, cast out, and measure it not, for it has been given to the Gentiles.”—*Apoc. x. 8—xi. 2.*¹

What have we here but a prefiguration of the two next great steps of advance in the Reformation :—*first*, the special commissioning by Christ of faithful spiritually prepared ministers of the Reformation, to preach his gospel in various countries and languages ;—*next*, the constitution and definition of evangelical and reformed churches, to the exclusion, as heathen-like and apostate, of the Church of Rome ?—Let us consider the two separately.

¹ The division of chapters here ought evidently not to have been made. The conference, begun in the xth between St. John and the Angel, is continued in the xith.

§ 1.—COMMISSIONING BY CHRIST OF THE GOSPEL-
PREACHERS OF THE REFORMATION.

“And the voice which I heard from heaven spake unto me again, &c. . . . And He said unto me, Thou must prophesy again before many peoples, and nations, and languages, and kings.”¹—Apoc. x. 8—11.

The points to be noted in this passage are the Spirit's direction to St. John to take the little book from the Angel,—the Angel's giving it him, together with the charge to eat, and prove both its sweetness and its bitterness,—then, after St. John's so eating and proving it, his solemnly *commissioning* him to the *resumption* of the work of his *ambassador* and *preacher of his gospel*; “Thou must prophesy again, before many peoples, and nations, and languages, and kings.”

I have paraphrased the word *prophesy* in the last clause of the quotation, as signifying the fulfilment of the work of *Christ's ambassador* and *gospel-preacher*. And it may perhaps be well,—considering the restricted signification of *predicting future events* that is now in common parlance almost alone attached to it, and the exposition also by many modern commentators, as if, “Thou must prophesy again,” meant, “Thou must *predict* again,” or, “*begin a new series of predictions*,”—to shew the reader that this both accords with the original and more proper sense of the word, as used in Scripture, and is moreover that which the context itself determines to be the sense here intended.

Προφητεω, then, is the Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew נִבְּאָה, —the Niphil of נִבְּאָה, to *bring forth, show, announce*: and to נִבְּאָה the first meaning affixed by Gesenius is “*to speak as God's ambassador*,” whatever the subject.² Thus it included not the prediction of

¹ See the completed quotation at the head of the Chapter above.

² He very appropriately cites Exod. vii. 1, by way of illustration; in which Aaron's official relation to Moses is thus stated, “Aaron thy brother shall be thy *prophet*: ”—a passage well explained by another preceding it, Exod. iv. 16;

future events only, but the general predication of God's mind and will, the explanation of his mysteries, the pleading of his cause, and, in this, the exhorting, instructing, reproof, warning, and expostulating with a rebellious people. The particular and restricted meaning of *predicting future events* came to be attached to the word simply as being *one* of the frequent functions of the prophetic office: just in the same way as that of *other* of the prophetic functions was attached to it, though less frequently, also.¹—So much as to the *Hebrew* original, and its *Septuagint* version, in the *Old Testament*. Nor is the use of the word *προφητεω* in the *New Testament* much different. For example, in Matt. vii. 22 the question, "Lord, have we not *prophesied* in thy name?" means evidently, "Have we not *preached as thy ambassadors*?" Similarly in that passage from the xth of the same Evangelist, "Whoso receiveth a *prophet* in the name of a *prophet* shall receive a *prophet's* reward," we cannot doubt but that each faithful *ambassador* of Christ, and *preacher* of his Gospel, is intended, whether endowed with the predictive faculty or not.² To which let me add, that the term was specially applied in the Apostolic times to the function of *expounding the written Scriptures*, and *exhorting* from them, in the Christian churches:³ a function then assis-

"He (Aaron) shall be thy *spokesman* to the people; and he shall be thy *mouth*; and thou shalt be to him as *Elohim*."

Passages such as that of Ezra vi. 14, will readily occur to the reader; "They prospered through the *prophesying* of Haggai:" i. e. through the time of Haggai's bearing the prophetic commission.

¹ So in Ezek. xxxvii. 4 of *preaching* to people; "Again He said unto me, Prophecy upon these bones, and say unto them, O ye dry bones, hear the word of the Lord!"—In verse 9, it is used of *prayer* for God's grace on the Jewish people; "He said unto me, Prophecy unto the wind, Son of man, and say, Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live." Similar to which is the use of the word in the account of Baal's prophets in 1 Kings xviii. 29; "And when the mid-day was passed, and they prophesied (i. e. called on Baal) until the time of the offering of the evening-sacrifice, there was neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded."—Yet again in 1 Chron. xxv. 1, we read of David separating persons "to the service of the sons of Asaph, who should *prophesy* with harps and psalteries and cymbals;" i. e. lead the devotions of the people in holy psalmody. To which I may add from the New Testament, Matt. xxvi. 68; "Prophecy who smote thee."

² It must be remembered that all preaching of Christ's Gospel necessarily involves the enunciation of God's predictions as to the great issues of futurity.

³ 1 Cor. xiv. 3; "But he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification,

ted by a more plenary inspiration of God's Spirit ; yet, otherwise, very much the prototype of the same prophetic function, as subsequently fulfilled in the Church by every faithful gospel-minister.

Thus from the *general* Scripture use of the word it appears that it is, in the present instance, open to us to construe it in the sense of *preaching the Gospel*, as Christ's ambassador, just as much as in that of *predicting future events*. From which if we turn to consider the *Apocalyptic context*, it will be evident, I think, that the former can alone be the true meaning.—For, *first*, this is the undoubted sense of the word as used by the Angel in his account of the Witnesses, just but a verse or two after that we were considering ; “ I will give power to my two Witnesses, and *they shall prophesy* 1260 days in sackcloth.” Who would construe it *there* to signify, “ They shall *enunciate predictions* for 1260 days ?”¹—*Further*, it is this sense which alone agrees with the *symbolic act* noted as the preparative to St. John's receiving the commission, “ Thou must prophesy again,”—I mean his *receiving and eating the little Book* in the Angel's hand. For the little Book is evidently the substance and manual of that which he was to prophesy. And as, in the precisely parallel case of *Ezekiel*,² the book given

and exhortation, and comfort.” Compare, in the same Epistle, chap. xiii. 2 ; “ Though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge :” also Rom. xii. 6 ; “ Or whether (they have the gift of) prophecy, let the prophesying be according to the proportion (or analogy) of the faith :” and Acts xv. 32 ; “ Judas and Silas, themselves being prophets, exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them.” See also 1 Cor. xi. 4.—In Bishop Taylor's “ *Liberty of Prophecy*,” the same sense attaches to the word.

In this sense, as we shall presently see, the *earliest Apocalyptic Expositors* took the word. And so in the middle age, as Foxe tells us, (on Apoc. x. 10,) *Thomas Aquinas*. “ *Prophetare* inquit Thomas, pro *predicare* accipitur.”—So again, passing from Papal Doctors, the *Reformers* also. Thus, not to cite individual expositors, the Helvetic Confession : “ *Prophetæ præscii futurorum vates erant ; sed et Scripturas interpretabantur ; quales etiam hodiè inveniuntur.*”

¹ xi. 3. In fact in this passage the *witnessing for Christ*, and the *prophesying* as his prophets, seem used almost as convertible terms. And so elsewhere also. For example in xix. 10 ; “ I am thy fellow-servant, and that of thy brethren that keep up the witness for Jesus : for the *witnessing for Jesus* is the *spirit of the prophesying* :” το πνευμα της προφητειας.

² *Ezekiel's* case is thus described; Ez. ii. 3, 7, &c. “ He said unto me, Son of man, I send thee to the children of Israel: and thou shalt speak my words unto them, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear. But thou, Son of man, hear what I say unto thee ! (Be not rebellious like that rebellious house !) Open

to be eaten by *him* was not the mere *predictive part* of God's message entrusted to his charge, but the *whole* of it, and moreover not to be prophesied by him simply by committal to *writing*, but to be declared and preached by him, as God's ambassador, to the Jewish people *vivâ voce*, ("I have made thee a *watchman* to this people,") so we may infer the same respecting both *the subject-matter* and the *mode*, here intended, of *St. John's* prophesying.—Nor must we omit to mark the consistency of the interpretation thus given with the antecedent part of the vision. For whereas the message entrusted to Ezekiel and the other prophets was the same substantially that we find in the prophetic Books bearing their names, it is the *gospel* of the *New Testament* that is emphatically enjoined as the subject-matter of preaching on every one of the ambassadors of Christ Jesus. And this was long since our inference respecting the *Little Book*, (an inference drawn from the circumstance of its opening being represented as the accompaniment and instrumental cause of the light of the Reformation,) that it must have been either the *whole Bible* in miniature form, or else some miniature *Part of the Bible*; such a Part as contained in it that which is the substance and essence of all Bible doctrine, the record of the gospel of the grace of Jesus:—and hence probably *Christ's gospel-ministers' chief manual*, the *Little Bible*, the *New Testament*.

This premised, and with the remembrance further of *St. John's symbolic character* on the Apocalyptic scene,

thy mouth, and eat that I give thee! And when I looked, behold a hand was sent unto me: and lo! a roll of a book was therein.... And He said unto me, Cause thy belly to eat, and fill thy bowels with this roll that I give thee. Then did I eat; and it was in my mouth as honey for sweetness." After which it follows in iii. 10; "Son of man, all my words that I shall speak unto thee receive in thine heart, and hear with thine ears!" and in verse 14; "So the Spirit lifted me up, and I went in *bitterness*, in the heat of my spirit."

To which let me add two other and not dissimilar cases.—1st. that of *Jeremiah*. Of him we thus read, Jer. xv. 16: "Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of my heart: for I am called by thy name, O Lord of Hosts!" i. e. called thy prophet. After which follows: "I sat alone because of thy hand, for thou hast filled me with indignation." He too had, in the delivery of God's word, to taste the bitterness as well as the sweetness."—2ndly the case of THE PROPHET *κατ' ἐξοχήν*; whose preparation for the prophetic work assigned Him is thus described by Himself, "My *meat* is to do the will of my Heavenly Father, and to accomplish his work." John iv. 34.

as representative of Christ's faithful ministers of the time figured,—more especially, in this present Act of the Apocalyptic Drama, of him that was the head, guide, and master-spirit of the ministers of the Reformation, *Martin Luther*,¹—the thing pre-signified in the passage heading the present Section will appear to be this ;—that, at the time following on Luther's recognition of Antichrist's voice in the Papal Thunders, as also of that Antichrist's fated and approaching doom, both he and other reformers with him, *impelled by the same heavenly influence* as before, and *prepared by the experimental digestion of the Gospel* in their own hearts, would be *commissioned* as from Christ Himself, (there being apparently some particular reason for noting this *divine origin* of their commission,) to go forth as his *gospel-preachers* and *witnesses*, specially against the Papacy :²—the word *again* implying some notable previous *suspension* or *interruption* of this preaching work ; (some-what, say Primasius and Ambrosius Ansbertus, as in the case of *St. John* himself, when by Domitian's Decree banished from the ministerial work to Patmos :³)—

¹ See pp. 87 and 110—112 *suprà*.

² This seems inferable from its being said “ *The same voice* which I heard from heaven,” (viz. that which said to him, ‘ Seal up what the seven thunders have said, and write them not ! ’) “ said to me again, Go, take the Book &c.”

³ *Primasius* comments thus on the verse. “ Sicut solet Scriptura de genere ad speciem sæpe deflectere, sed etiam consequenter utraque complecti, sic et nunc ad Johannem quidem intentio certa dirigitur, quem adhuc oportebat, de exilio liberatum, non tantùm hanc revelationem in notitiam ecclesiæ Christi deferre, sed etiam evangelium in populos, in nationes, in linguas, et reges multos altiùs predicare. Veruntamen *omni* quoque *ecclesiæ* hanc vocem nullus ambigit convenire, quæ nunquam debet à prædicatione desistere.” *Bibl. Patr. Max.* x. 313.

Ambrosius Ansbertus, who had evidently *Primasius* before him, enlarges on the same idea of this double reference to the type and antitype, to *St. John* and the ministers of the Church in after times. “ *Johannes* itaque pæne omnia (imo omnia quæ præmissa sunt) non *specialiter* ex suâ, sed *generaliter* ex electorum protulit personâ. Nunc autem illa quæ in hoc versu narrantur et suæ et aliorum personis congruere docet.—Ad *Johannis speciem* intentio certa dirigitur, quia dicitur, ‘ Oportet te iterum prophetare coram populis, &c ; ’ quem adhuc oportebat ab insulâ Patmo Ephesum reductum non solùm hanc Apocalypsim, quam manu suâ inibi scripserat, ad notitiam sanctorum deferre, verùm etiam evangelium populis et gentibus et linguis et regibus multis altiùs quàm alii prædicare. In prædictâ siquidem Patmo insulâ, à Domitiano exilio deportatus, hanc vidit Apocalypsim : et cùm provecatæ esset ætatis, putaretque se celerius ad Christum migrare,—interfecto impio Casare, et post cuncta ejus jussa divino judicio cassata,—ab exilio reductus præfatam Apocalypsim ecclesiæ tradidit legendam. Ebione autem, Valentino, ac Cerintho adversùs Christum oblatrantibus, episcoporum precibus

the concluding words of the sentence further indicating that this gospel-preaching would thenceforth be before *many different kings and people*, and also in many different *languages*.—All this, I say, seems to be implied; nor will the historical fulfilment here fail to appear on investigation, as simply and completely as in all before.

Before proceeding however to shew this in the sequel of the history of Luther and the Reformation, let us mark, in passing glance, a few prominent facts respecting the *practice* and *regulation* of the function of *gospel-preaching*, as they strike an observer in the progressive history of public worship in the Christian Church.

“Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature!” Such were the terms of our Lord Jesus Christ’s original and never-to-be-forgotten commission to his Apostles. The instrument He would make use of from the first, for the promulgation of his Gospel, was the *living voice of men* declaring and preaching it,—the “*viva favella d’uomo* :”¹ and the terms of the

flexus, Evangelium etiam scripsit. Et ideo tot populis et gentibus et regibus et linguis prophetavit, quia ejus Evangelium ad eorum notitiam pervenit.—Verum etiam, ut præmisimus, ea quæ *illi* specialiter ascribuntur *sanctis prædicatoribus* generaliter deputantur. Ad quorum personam rectè nunc dicitur, ‘Oportet te iterum prophetare &c;’ quia nimirum toto tempore vitæ præsentis, aliis ad Christum migrantibus electorum, ecclesia in subsequentibus suis prædicatoribus iterum non desinit prophetare.—*Prophetare* autem intelligere debemus *prædicare*; quia et Paulus dicit, “Prophetæ duo vel tres dicant, et cæteri dijudicent” *Bibl. Patr. Max. xiii. 519.*

In the *general* application to church-ministers it will be observed, 1st that both Primasius and Ambrosius Ansbertus interpret *prophetare* as tantamount to *prædicare*; although somewhat inconsistently in *St. John’s personal* case they explain the word, not as we might expect, of his resuming his *preaching* labors, but of his *publishing the Apocalypse* and the *Gospel* that bears his name, on his return from Patmos: 2. that in the *general* application they explain the word *again* of the rising up of a continually-renewed succession in the Church of gospel-preachers, as elder ones in the ministry might die off.—In which latter view they quit the parallelism between St. John’s personal particular case, and that of the Christian Church and ministry at the time prefigured. For, did the parallelism hold, it seems plain that we ought to suppose the gospel preachers of the time prefigured to be under some similar authoritative suspension and interruption, in regard of the exercise of their ministerial and preaching functions, as St. John in Patmos.

I have given the above extracts at length, as being perhaps about the best specimens I could select of the application made by early patristic expositors of that great exegetic principle, of which I have made so much use, of St. John’s representative character on the Apocalyptic scene.

¹ Dante. A similar phrase *παρα ζωσσης φωνης*, is used by Papias in reference

promise added, "Lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world,"¹ while they assured to his servants the needful help of his presence, shewed moreover that the charge and the promise included not the disciples then present only, but their successors also in the Christian ministry, even to the consummation.—So the Apostles themselves proceeded at once to fulfil the charge: and who knows not the wonderful success that, as might have been anticipated from Christ's promised presence and help, attended them in it? The weapon of warfare assigned them, however despicable in the eyes of men, proved mighty with multitudes, to the pulling down of strong holds, and bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believed."

Now it is to be observed that it was not in addresses to the *heathen* only, but in the *congregations* of the *Church* also, as it was gradually formed and extended, that this important function of declaring Christ's Gospel, and all Scripture as bearing on it, was to be fulfilled; (that same word which, as it had been the instrument in the first instance of their conversion to Christianity, was also still profitable, we may say essential, for reproof, for doctrine, for correction, and instruction in the way of righteousness:)—the *reading* of the Scriptures being included, with this object, as well as the *preaching*, according to the divinely approved practice of the Jewish synagogue.² All this appears from the Apostolic precepts and ordinance. The *reading* of the inspired epistles in their congregational worship is enjoined by the Apostle Paul himself³ on the early churches. The official ministration in them (one to

to knowledge gained from the conversation of living Christians, in contrast with that derived from the Christian books. Euseb. iii. 39.

¹ *συντελειας τῆς αἰωνος*, the end of the *age*. Matt. xxviii. 20.

² See the narrative, Luke iv. 17, &c, of Christ's attendance on a Sabbath at the synagogue of Nazareth, and there having the Book of the Prophet Isaiah given him, from which to preach and exhort. Compare also Acts xiii. 15, xv. 21.

³ Col. iv. 16; "When this epistle has been read by you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans: and that ye likewise read the epistle (transmitted) from Laodicea." 1 Thess. v. 27; "I adjure you by the Lord that this epistle be read to all the holy brethren."

which I have already alluded¹⁾ of those that were called *prophets*, exhibits to us the commencement of the practice of expounding and exhorting from the written Scriptures.² Further, the charge to Timothy, "Preach the word! Do the work of an evangelist! Make full proof thy ministry!" appears both from Timothy's appointed office as a Bishop, and also from the prophetic warning added, "For the time will come when they" (evidently professed Christians) "will not endure sound doctrine, but will heap to themselves teachers having itching ears,"³ to have had reference, principally at least, to ministrations in the *Christian Church*.—Thus much, I say, we may infer from Scripture as to the Apostolic times and practice; and both as regards the *reading* and the *preaching*, the ecclesiastical records of the three next centuries represent them as then a constant part of the common Christian Sunday worship.⁴

Pass we on then a few centuries in the history of Christendom. In some 400 years, as we know, Christianity had subverted heathenism on the Roman earth.

¹ p. 145 *suprà*.

² From the passage, "But if all prophesy," i. e. successively, "and there come in one that believeth not, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all," (1 Cor. xiv. 24.) it appears that heathens might then attend, and hear the Scripture exposition.

³ 2 Tim. iv. 2, 3, 5.

⁴ So Justin Martyr, Apolog. i. ch. 67: Τη τε ἡλις λεγομένη ἡμέρα παντων επι το αυτο συνελευσις γινεται και τα απομνηνευματα των αποσολων, η τα συγγραμματα των προφητων αναγιγνωσκειται, μεχρις ερχωρει' ειτα, παυσαμεν τε αναγιγνωσκοντος, ο προεστως δια λογην την νθεσιαν της των καλων τβτων μιμησεως ποιειται επειτα ανισταμεθα παντες, και ευχας πεμπομεν, &c. See also Tertullian, Apolog. c. 39—From a passage in his De Præscr. Her. 36,—"Legem et Prophetas cum Evangeliiis ex Apostolicis literis miscet Ecclesia, et inde potat fidem,"—it appears that the range of the *reading* then embraced *all Scripture*; and all as pointing out the *Christian Faith*, i. e. Christ. So much as to the second century.

For the two next centuries I refer to the Apostolical Constitutions, Chrysostom, and Augustine. The first says, *δταν αναγιγνωσκομενον η το ευαγγελιον. . . παρακαλει τωσαν οι πρεσβυτεροι τον λαον, ο καθεις αυτων, αλλα μη απαντες, και τελευταιος παντων ο επισκοπος*. Augustine speaks of an anthem preceding the Liturgy, then scripture-reading, (first the Prophets, then the Epistles,) then a Psalm, then the Gospel, then the bishop's Sermon. All the Books of the Old and New Testaments were read in the fourth century. See Bingham, xiv. 3. 2, or Riddle's Antiq. 394, 405.

In this early Christian worship the heathen attended up to the *reading* of the Scripture and the *preaching*, as well as Christians; just as in St. Paul's time; (see Note 2 *suprà*);—then, they and the catechumens having been dismissed, the *prayers*, *Lord's supper*, and *agapæ* followed. See Palmer's English Ritual, i. 13, &c.—This was the *Sunday* service; Sunday being the only day of public worship (the fact is one well worth observing) in the two first centuries.

A century or two later, the Goths, that invaded as heathens or Arians, had settled down into orthodox christianity. Thus the world was, in outward profession, identified with the Church. Within the precincts of the old Roman empire, it was in the Church alone that the work of the evangelist, the preaching of the gospel-word, had thenceforth to be performed.—And what then the performance?—We find from the rituals that both the *reading* and *preaching* did continue *formally* to be integral parts of the church-service. But, as regards the *reading*,—besides the diminution of Scripture lessons in the congregational worship, arising partly out of the monastic multiplication of services, accordantly with the now recognized *seven canonical hours* of prayer, (the most of which services were attended by priests and monks only,) and apportionment to them of much that was before read to the congregation,¹—besides this, I say, *legends of saints*² had now begun to be read at times, instead of Scripture ;—the *Psalms*, the chief Scripture lessons remaining, were *chanted* by priests, instead of being *read* to the people ;—and moreover in the West, as language underwent its mutations, through the intermixture and settlement of the invading Gothic hordes, the *Latin* in which they were chanted,³ was rapidly becoming an *unknown tongue*.—Then as to the *preaching* (which

¹ See Palmer's English Rit. i. 202, and ii. 46—48. In the passage last referred to, Mr. P. notes the discontinuance in the Western Churches of the Old Testament Lessons ;—a change arising probably out of the cause noted in the text above. In the former passage he observes how judiciously the *Nocturns*, *Matins*, and *Prime* were at the Reformation, under Edward the Sixth, abridged and compressed into the English Morning Sunday Service, the *Vespers* and *Compline* into its Evening. In fact there was in this a reversion to primitive antiquity ; which had but two Sunday Services, the early Morning and the Evening.

See also Bingham xiii. 9. 8, xiv. 3. 12 ; who says that after the introduction of the canonical hours the longer lessons were assigned to the *antelucan*, the shorter to the *other* canonical hours.—On the introduction of which *canonical hours* it may be useful to turn to the account of Jerom in Gilly's *Vigilantius*, p. 253.

² Hence called *legenda*, writings to be read. Their introduction into the Church service was as early as the 5th century. Bingham, xiv. 3. 14.

³ “ Des le sixième siècle la langue Latine étoit tombée dans un état de corruption peut-être irréparable. . . Il s'étoit établi une transmutation des voyelles, presque toujours employées les unes à la place des autres.” So Raynouard, *Poesies des Troubadours*, i. 16.

The *Psalter* used in the Gallican Church before the close of the 6th century was Jerom's *Latin* translation ; although called indeed the *Gallican Psalter*, from its being first authoritatively received by that Church. Bingham ib. 17.

is our more immediate subject) it had both become rare, and, where performed, of any thing but the primitive evangelic character. To the former result (its *rarity*) two causes had contributed, of early origin. First, the narrow view of its *obligation*, as if incumbent on the *Bishops* only; ¹ which (though the faculty was accorded in practice to *certain* of the *city Presbyters* and *Deacons*) operated necessarily to deprive the mass of the rural population of the preaching of the word of God: ² next, that early exaggerated and unsound estimate of the inherent efficacy of the sacraments, long since spoken of, which led both clergy and people to consider that, where the sacraments were administered, all was done that was *essential* of the duties of the priesthood.³—The second result, I mean the general *unevangelic character* of preaching, where continued, followed necessarily from the darkening *superstitions* begun ere the end of the fourth century.⁴ After which period, and amidst the political convulsions of the two centuries succeeding, the continued and increasing darkness of *superstition* having that of the grossest intellectual *ignorance* superadded to it, an incompetence characterized the clergy, such that thenceforth, even if Prince or Council more zealous than others might wish to enforce the right fulfilment of the clerical duties, the *preaching of the Gospel* was scarce enjoined on Priests, or even Bishops, as if a performance

¹ Bingham, ii. 3. 4.—Thus Prudentius, speaking of the *pulpit*, speaks as if the Bishop alone preached from it: Hymn. de Hippol.

Fronte sub adversâ gradibus sublime tribunal
Tollitur, *antistes* prædicat unde Deum.

In the Theodosian Code there is an Edict of Theodosius I and Gratian, A. D. 384, "De munere seu officio *Episcoporum* in prædicando verbo Dei," speaking of a bishop's neglect of preaching as sacrilege: but still showing that it was regarded distinctively as a *bishop's*, not (generally at least) a presbyter's office.

² Even in Chrysostom's time, and by Chrysostom, this was confessed. Bingham, xiv. 4. 9.—A Canon of the Council of Vaison, held A. D. 529, strikingly illustrates the evil and its cause, while seeking to remove them. "Hoc etiam pro edificatione omnium ecclesiarum, et pro utilitate totius populi nobis placuit, —ut non solum in civitatibus, sed etiam in omnibus parochiis, verbum faciendi daremus presbyteris potestatem." *Ib.*

³ How different St. Paul's feeling! "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel!" &c. &c. 1 Cor. i. 17.

⁴ See the characteristic specimen of a sermon of Chrysostom on St. Paul's greatness and character given by Le Bas in the Introduction to his Life of Wickliff, p. 11. See too Mosheim, iii. 2. 4. 2, iv. 2. 4. 3; also my Vol. I. pp. 302—311.

out of the question. The reading of certain Homilies, translated by the Bishop, or by some one more learned, from the earlier Fathers, (that which in other times had been but an alternative,¹) was now enjoined in lieu of sermons, as quite the best to hope for.² And even these were after a while for the most part omitted in the West ;³ Rome itself, much the first, setting the example.⁴—Besides all which there were now *restrictions*, canonically imposed, on the free preaching of the Gospel, that would necessarily impede its revival. First, as already intimated, the rule existed that no *Presbyter* might preach, unless *expressly authorized by the Bishop*.⁵ Again, A. D. 691, it had been made a Canon of the Trullan Council, (a Council supplemental to the 6th General Council, celebrated just before at Constantinople,) that in their preachings, especially on all controverted points, the Bishops should take care to broach no opinion *diverse* from what was *received as orthodox*, or from the “*divine tradition of the Fathers*.”⁶ It is evident that either rule was capable of application, such as to oppress the

¹ In the Life of Cæsarius, (Bishop of Arles for nearly the first half of the sixth century,) Cyprian (previously Deacon under Cæsarius) notices his zealous performance of preaching every sabbath day ; and how, when infirm, “*vices suas presbyteris et diaconis committebat, à quibus sermones, aut à se aut ab aliis patribus compositas, recitari. Et ne sacerdotes alii à prædicandi munere forte se excusarent, transmisit quod in ecclesiis suis prædicari facerent;—sc. dictatas à se Homilias sive Conciones.*”—Compare the Canons of the Council of Vaison, held under his presidency. Hard. ii. 1105.

² In Gaul, *Alcuin* and others composed Homilies by command of Charlemagne, for this purpose: whence the collection was called the *Homiliarium of Charlemagne*. See Mosheim, viii. 2. 3. 5 ; who says the effect was only to increase the sloth of the clergy.—Again in the 2nd Council of Rheims, A. D. 874, and 3rd of Tours, 887, a provision of Homilies from the Fathers, translated into the vulgar tongue, was enjoined on the *bishops*. Palmer, ii. 64 ; Martene, iii. 24.

³ Palmer, ii. 61.

⁴ Sozomen notes even in the 5th century that no Sermons or Exhortations were delivered in the Roman Church. He remarks on it as then a singular omission. So also Cassiodore. Sozom. vii. 19. (See Valesius' Note ad loc.) Leo I revived the practice of preaching a while ; then the neglect was renewed for ages.—Bingham, xiv. 4. 3.

⁵ Bingham, ii. 3. 4.

⁶ “*Oportet eos qui præsent ecclesiis in omnibus quidem diebus, præcipuè Dominicis, omnem clerum et populum docere pietatis et rectæ religionis eloquia ; ex diversâ Scripturâ colligentes intelligentias et judicia veritatis, et non transgredientes jam positos terminos, vel dirinorum Patrum traditionem. Sed et si ad Scripturam pertinens controversia aliqua excitata fuerit, ne illam aliter interpretentur quàm quomodo ecclesiæ luminaria et doctores suis scriptis exposuerint.*” Canon xix. Martene, iii. 24.—The “*ii qui præsent ecclesiis*” are the *Bishops* ;

preaching of Christ's Gospel, wheresoever the orthodoxy in vogue might be a system corrupt and erroneous, and the tradition of the Fathers regarded as accordant with it. In fact they passed with this use for evil, and not for good, and that for a permanency, into the whole Western Church.¹

So were the dark middle ages entered on; and as they advanced, the neglect of this primary duty of the Christian ministry continued through the length and breadth of Christendom. Here and there we read of attempts at its revival; for example in England by the Archbishop Egbert, Bede's cotemporary,² by king Alfred,³ and by Archbishop Elfric.⁴—But the attempts were but as momentarily as partially successful. About the middle of these dark ages the doctrine of *transubstantiation* gaining authorization, confirmed the Clergy more than ever in their neglect of the work of the evangelist.⁵ As the general undue exaltation of the sacraments in the fourth century led to its depreciation, how

specified as if those to whom the *duty* of preaching belonged alone, and who could alone be supposed able to perform it. The *clerus* or *clergy* are mentioned, it will be seen, as those that were to *be taught*, not to *teach*.

How different the use of the Trullan Canon in the *English reformed Church* under Edward the Sixth!

¹ For example, we meet the *former*, in a Royal Ordinance of the 14th century, against Wicliffite preachers, charging them with preaching "*without license of the Ordinary*;" and, as the proper penalty, delivering them over to the Sheriff to imprison. And so too in the case of Huss. (See Foxe's Martyr. iii. 408, &c.)—The *latter* also meets us again in the 13th and following centuries, and as abused to the same purport, in Canons of the 4th and 5th Lateran Councils; which latter has been already noticed, p. 82 *suprà*.

² In Egbert's Pontifical Book we find the following order; "Ut omnibus festis et diebus Dominicis unusquisque sacerdos evangelium Christi prædicet populo." Martene *ibid*.

³ On Alfred's accession, A. D. 872, it has been said that not a single Priest was to be found south of the Thames, who knew Latin enough to understand the daily services which he muttered. His efforts at instructing and evangelizing both the priesthood and the people are noted in every history of England.

⁴ Elfric in 957 issued an order for the priests in each parish to explain the Gospel, Creed, and Lord's Prayer to the people. He also composed Homilies for their use.

⁵ Having been for some two or three centuries previous preached on and promulgated, (see pp. 11, 57 *suprà*,) it was at length in the year 1215 authoritatively adopted and enforced by Pope Innocent III, and the fourth Lateran Council.

Let me here add that the sacrament had even in the third century been called a *sacrifice*, a *bloodless sacrifice*, and mysterious expressions used of Christ's presence in it; though not till now in the sense of *transubstantiation*. To use Mr. Milman's words; "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper imperceptibly acquired the solemnity and the appellation of a sacrifice. The mysterious identification of the

much more the dogma of the Priest having power, in the one of those two sacraments, to offer up at his pleasure, and for his congregation, the all-atoning sacrifice of the Lamb of God! Their salvation thereby ensured, if he pleased it, what the need of preaching the gospel to them?—Hence from the lips of the parochial clergy, the sound of the Gospel was a sound in those middle ages all but obsolete. What Archbishop Peckham said of the state of *England* in his time was applicable generally to the state of *Christendom*; that the “duty of preaching had been so neglected as to reduce no small portion of the people to the state of the poor and needy, who seek water and there is none.”¹ On the rise of the *mendicant Friars*, they gained credit, as observed in a former chapter, by professedly reviving the practice.² But it was in fact no revival of *gospel*-preaching. Their preaching was for the most part little more than a setting forth of the lying legends of saints, (insomuch that *legends* and *fables* came to be words of identical meaning,³) or perhaps declamatory orations, in the style and with the false dogmas of the schools.⁴—A few exceptions indeed there were; (in the *Church*, I mean, not here referring to *direct separatists*;) and one especially glorious, about a century after Bishop Peckham, I mean that of

Redeemer with the concentrated elements was first felt by the mind; till at a later period a material and corporeal transmutation began to be asserted. That which the earlier Fathers in the boldest figure called a bloodless sacrifice, became an actual oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ.” *Hist. of Christianity*, iii. 427.

¹ Le Bas’ *Wicliff*, i. 85. Mr. Le Bas adds that “to remedy the crying evil, the Archbishop commanded that each parochial clergyman should preach to his people, either himself or by a substitute, once at least in every quarter of a year; and should expound to them in a popular manner, and without any fantastic texture of subtilty, the fourteen Articles of Faith, ten Commandments, two-fold precepts of love to God and our neighbour, the seven works of charity, seven capital sins, with their progeny, the seven principal virtues, and seven sacraments of grace. And, lest the clergy should convert their own ignorance into a dispensation from the order, he adds a variety of instructions for the proper discharge of the duty.

² See p. 31 *suprà*. The Canon of the 4th Lateran Council, “*De Prædicatoribus instituendis*,” instituting them, will be found in *Hard*, vii. 27.

³ Originally legends meant *legenda*, pieces to be read in service; as stated p. 152 Note 2 *suprà*.—Compare 2 *Tim.* iv. 4; “And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and be turned to *fables*.”

⁴ Le Bas, 211.—See the specimen given by Hottinger from a book of Sermons composed by the Theological Faculty of Vienna, A. D. 1430; Bingham, xiv. 4. 18.—Melancthon, in his *Apology*, speaks of Aristotle’s *Ethics* being sometimes read to the people, instead of the Gospel, shortly before the Reformation.

Wicliff. “Regarding,” says Le Bas, “the neglect of the office of preaching as the *foulest treason* to Christ,” he both himself set the example of indefatigable preaching of the Gospel, in style plain and popular to the people,¹ and moreover sent forth his *poor priests* as preaching missionaries;—having previously translated the Bible into English, for the better preparation of both preachers and people. And as *Wicliff* in England, so too *Huss* in Bohemia. But both the *Wicliffite* preaching ministers, and the *Hussites*, were soon excommunicated as heretics, and nearly suppressed by the terrors of the sword.² In the Church, things returned much into their former course.—Thus this most important function of the Christian ministry continued to be neglected almost universally. Living addresses to the heart and conscience, fresh from the living fountain of truth, and making appeal by the setting forth of God’s grace and love through a dying, risen, and interceding Saviour, continued all but unknown in the church-worship, even up to the close of the 15th century, and epoch of *Luther’s* first preaching: in other words to the commencement of the Reformation.

And now having to show the fulfilment of the Apocalyptic symbolization contained in the passage that heads the present Section, “The Angel said, *Thou must prophesy again* before many nations, &c,” in other words, must resume and revive the function and work of *gospel-preaching*,—a symbolization that will be found to mark the precise epoch and step of progress next notable in the Reformation,—it may naturally occur to the reader that *Luther* had already, from very soon after his first discovery of gospel-light, begun partially at least to fulfil the holy work. And, in fact, I think it will be well worth our while for a moment to pause on this circumstance; and to mark how he did it in accordance, as he deemed, with his *ordination vows* and *ritual*.

For so it was that though, on ordination to the *Priest-*

¹ *Ibid* 210. There still remain above 300 of his *Postils*, or *expository* discourses on Scripture.

² See my Chapter viii *infra*, on the Death of Christ’s prophesying Witnesses.

hood, the *paten* and the *chalice* having been delivered into his hands by the ordaining Bishop, he was therewith only empowered and enjoined to *sacrifice* (i. e. in private masses and the sacramental rite) *for the living and the dead*,—(a ceremonial awfully blasphemous, as Luther himself soon learnt to view it,¹ and which, arising out of the reception throughout Western Europe of the doctrine of *transubstantiation*,² had been adopted to mark that which was considered as the consecrated priest's grand office, to the supercession of all inferior and obsolete offices, like that of *preaching the word*,) yet at his previous ordination as *Deacon* there had been observed and given him a ritual and a charge, not of late institution, but comparatively primitive,³ and not founded on man's falsehood, but on Christ's own express appointment; which, agreeably with the proper significancy of the rite,⁴

¹ "At the moment when the officiating Bishop (Jerom of Bradenburgh) conferred on him the power of celebrating the mass, he put the cup into his hand, and addressed him with the solemn words, *Accipe potestatem sacrificandi pro vivis et mortuis!* At a later period the words made Luther shudder. 'That the earth did not swallow us both up,' he said, 'was an instance of the patience and long-suffering of God.'" Merle D'Aub. i. 172. Compare ib. p. 271.

² See p. 155.—Martene (ii. 23) refers the origin of the ceremony to the beginning of the tenth century; quoting Hugh Victorin, Peter Lombard, &c., in illustration.—The former, in his *De Sacramentis*, ii. 3. 12, says; "Accipiunt calicem cum vino, et patenam cum hostiâ, de manu episcopi, quatenus his instrumentis potestatem se accepisse agnoscant placabiles Deo hostias offerendi."

³ Comparatively *primitive* because, though not generally adopted in the *continental* churches of Western Christendom till the tenth century in the ritual of ordination, yet it appears that the sacred Book to be read by him to the people was on his ordination delivered to the *Lector* at least, before A. D. 400, (see next Note :) and with regard to the *Deacon* that in Egbert's Pontifical bearing date in the 9th century, the giving the *Book of the Gospels* to him is mentioned as the established and only known custom. So too on the ordination of the *chief Deacon*, in the churches of the *Syrian Maronites* and *Syrian Nestorians*. See Martene, ii. 21, 35, 103, 110. Also Note 1 p. 159.

⁴ The *traditio instrumenti* was always meant to signify the *function* ordained to. Thus in a Council of Carthage held A. D. 398, (Hard. i. 979,) we find described the ceremonies of ordination of the several inferior sacred orders then recognized;—of the *Psalmistæ* or *Singers*, the *Ostarii* or *Doorkeepers*, the *Readers*, the *Exorcists*, the *Acolyths*, or *Lighters of wax-lights* in service, and the *Subdeacons*. And the following are the rites prescribed: that, on the ordaining of the *Door-keeper*, the *key of the Church* be delivered into his hands by the Bishop,—on that of the *Reader* the *Culex* or *Book* out of which he was to read,—on that of the *Exorcist* the *Book of Exorcisms*,—on that of *Acolyth* the *Wax-candle sconce*,—on that of the *Subdeacon*, (whose business it was to carry the sacred vessels to the officiating Priest,) the *Chalice* and the *Paten*, but each *empty*;—the latter being thus distinguished from the *Priest's* ordination, where the *Chalice* delivered, (i. e. after the 12th century,) had *wine* in it, and the *Paten* the *Hostia*, or *transubstantiated bread*.—Elsewhere the same *traditio instrumenti* is noted of the *Psalmista* also. See Martene, ii. 18, 19, 75.—Riddle (*Christian Antiq.* p. 275) says

pointed to it. For the *Book of the Gospels* being then placed in his hand by the Bishop,¹ he was thus charged, "Take authority to read the Gospel in the Church of God;"² and words were added respecting his duty, as that not only of "assisting the priests in ministrations at the altar," but also of "declaring the Gospel and other Scriptures of the New Testament, and of preaching the word of God."³ Thus, mere form as it had now become, and lost all its spirit, and the duty confined to reading the Gospel in an unknown tongue, and in the priest's case thought to be superseded by the higher function of sacrificing for the living and dead,—so that the rite remained but

that the ceremony of delivering the sacred vessels &c. to the parties ordained, was not established *as a whole* till the 7th century; though several particulars of it may be traced to an earlier date.

On the same principle, on any cleric's condemnation for heresy, he was first degraded from his sacred function by the taking away of his badge of office. So in the case of *Sautre*, condemned by Archbishop Arundel, his degradation from Holy Orders was signified by the taking from him successively of *all* these *instrumenta officii*. As *priest* he was deprived of the *paten* and *chalice*; as *deacon* of the *New Testament*; as *subdeacon* of the *alb* and *maniple*; as *acolyte* of the *candlestick*, *taper*, and *urceole*; as *exorcist* of the *book of exorcisms*; as *lector* of the *lectionary*; as *sexton* of the *keys of the church*. And then his *clerical tonsure* was erased; and he was given up as a *layman* to the secular court. Southey's *Book of the Church*, ch. xi.

¹ From the above case of *Sautre* the Book then given in the *English* diaconal ordination would seem to have been the *New Testament*. Elsewhere it was almost universally the *Book of the Gospels*, as that chiefly to be read by him.

So Sozomen, in the fifth century, *Hist. Ecc.* vii. 19; *Ταυτην δε την ιεραν βιβλον (scil. των ευαγγελιων) αναγνωσκει ενθαδε* (sc. in the Alexandrian Church) *μονος ο αρχιδιακονος, παρα δε αλλοις ο διακονος, εν πολλαις δε εκκλησιαις δι ιερεις μονοι, εν δε επισημοις ημεραις επισκοποι.*—In Peter Siculus' account of the origin of Paulikians in the 7th century it is mentioned that the conversion of Constantine, founder of the Sect, arose from the perusal of two books given him by a Deacon whom he had entertained, returning from captivity in Syria; the one the *Book of the Gospels*, the other the *Book of St. Paul's Epistles*. B. P. M. xvi. 759.

² "Accipe potestatem legendi Evangelium in ecclesiâ Dei!" it being added, —an addition grafted on the doctrine of purgatory, and which Luther would little respect,—"*tam pro vivis quàm pro defunctis.*" I take this from the ancient ritual of *Mayence* given by Martene ii. 79; *Mayence* being the Archbishoprick to which Erfurd and Wittenberg were subject.—In the yet older *British Pontifical* of Egbert, (Ib. ii. 35,) the words of commission were, "Accipe istud volumen Evangelii, et lege, et intellige, et aliis trade!" So also in that of the Monastery of Bec. Ib. 64.

³ In the *Mayence* ritual, the ordaining Bishop is directed thus to declare the duties of their office to the candidates for Deacon's orders gathered round him: "Diaconum oportet sacerdotibus assistere, et ministrare ad altare, et in aliis sacramentis ecclesiæ, atque Evangelium aliamque Scripturam Novi Testamenti pronuntiare, et prædicare verbum Dei." Ib. 79.—The summary of the Deacon's duty given in the *Sermo*, similarly comprehends that of preaching: "In Novo Testamento ab apostolis ordinati (sc. Diaconi,) divini verbi præcones. . . constituuntur." This *Sermo*, or Address to the candidates, is from a Pontifical of the Church of Rouen. *Ibid.* 18.

like a shadowy silent protest from early antiquity, against the Church that had so set aside the reading and the preaching to the people of the pure word of God, yet Luther, taught as he was by the Spirit, even before his discovery of the antichristian character of the Papacy, felt, as others felt not, the solemnity of the charge. And, his subsequent ordination as *Priest* not in his mind invalidating the obligation, and the order of his Vicar General having confirmed it,¹ and the more he was quickened from above, the deeper becoming his sense of the obligation laid on him, (for he looked through the ordaining Bishop to Him in whose name he considered the Bishop to have acted, even the *Lord Jesus*,²) he had thus given himself quite early, and while yet but partially enlightened, to the fulfilment of the function of *Evangelist*.

And so then (as before noted) the Church of Wittenberg heard the strange sound of a revived preaching of the gospel: while at the same time both by his preaching, his lectures in the University, the circulation of evangelic writings, and the influence of personal communication, as also that which he had occasion officially to exercise in a Visitation, as the Vicar-general's substitute, of the Augustinian convents in Electoral Saxony,³ he was already unconsciously but effectively and earnestly preparing for evangelical preachers, in a new and better church soon to be established, not a few others of the monks and clergy. Afterwards, when his mind began to open to the true character of the Papacy, could this his desire but increase? "Would that we could multiply *living*

¹ See p. 96 *suprà*.

² "In nomine Domini," occurs frequently as used by the Bishop in the rituals of ordination.—I need not remind the reader how early the Bishop was looked on in the Church, in respect of his official functions, as Christ's representative. And justly so, when the Bishop ruled and acted *according to Scripture*. But Ignatius and Cyprian little anticipated the subsequent abuse of this title of honour, by application to the Episcopal office, when most unscripturally exercised.

³ This was as early as the year 1516. M. Merle D'Aub. observes on it, (i. 212) "that before the world had heard of Luther's opinions, they were discussed in the convents, especially those of the Augustins; and that more than one convent thus became a nursery of the Reformation: so that as soon as the great blow was struck at the Papacy, men of boldness and piety issued from their obscurity; and quitted the retirement of the monastic life, for the active career of ministers of the word of God."

books, i. e. *preachers*,"¹—was in 1520 the expression of his most cherished heart's wish. And when the truth burst fully on him, and in Rome's seven thunders he recognised the voice of Antichrist, the feeling rooted itself the deeper. Of the *restrictions* that we have noted, he perceived at once the antichristian tendency, and set them aside. Remonstrances from *his Bishop* on this point he heeded not. Again, he wrote in his final letter to the Pope, "There must be no fettering of Scripture with *rules of interpretation*;" referring doubtless to the decrees already noted of the Trullan and Lateran Councils. "The word of God must be left free."² And both himself and his brother reformers acted on the feeling.

But now mark the *crisis*! It followed (just agreeably with the position of the vision before us) forthwith after Luther's rejection of the Papal oracle, as the voice of the foredoomed Antichrist, and persistence therein at Worms before the Emperor. For thereupon the supreme *secular* and *ecclesiastical* powers had issued condemnatory decrees against both him and his fellow-labourers, and so against the gospel-ministry itself. By those of the *latter* they were excommunicated from the church, and degraded from the ministerial office: by those of the *former* they were, on pain of confiscation, imprisonment, and even death, interdicted from the preaching of the Gospel.³ And as for Luther himself, he was proscribed as one out of the protection of the law; so that confinement in a lonesome castle of the Wartburg forest seemed to his friend the Elector of Saxony the only alternative, whereby to hide him a while from the storm, and to save his life.⁴ Then was the time for his reflect-

¹ "Si vivos libros, hoc est concionatores, possemus multiplicare." Merle ii, 114. Compare the similar expression of Dante and Papias, p. 149 *suprà*.

² "Leges interpretandi verbi Dei non patior, cum oporteat verbum Dei esse non alligatum." Merle D'Aub. ii, 127.

³ See Merle or Milner.

⁴ Wartburg Castle is one mile from Eisnach in Thuringia. Its site marks the boundary of the inroads of the Romans under Drusus, who could penetrate no further into the Hercynian forest. The castle was erected about A. D. 1070 by Count Ludwig, and now appears in the Byzantine style of architecture. Early in the 13th century Count Herman made it famous as the focus of German poe-

ing in solemn solitude and insulation, (somewhat like St. John himself when in exile for the testimony of Jesus, and Luther indeed marked and stamped the resemblance by calling the castle his *Patmos*,) on things past, present, and future: on what had been done in other days, and on what it now needed that he should do, for the cause and church of the Lord Jesus.—And what then did he? Did he bow to the storm, and abandon the work? Let us but follow out the apocalyptic figurations, as further enacted by St. John on the visionary dramatic scene, and we shall find that what *he* then and there heard, felt, and did, depicted in just the truest and best manner the next actings of Luther, and therewith the further progress of the Reformation.

First “the voice said, Go, *take the Little Book* out of the Angel’s hand.” The chief occupation to which Luther was directed from above during this his year of exile,¹ was the taking in hand the *New Testament*, with a view to its translation into the vernacular German. To this he was impelled, not only by his own love of the Book, but by the conviction of its being that which would prove his most powerful help towards the diffusion of gospel light in Germany,² and the overthrow of the Papal superstition. And truly it was a work in which his very soul felt complacency. He expresses his annoyance when forced by any temporary necessity of controversial writing from it.³ Already long since he had fed upon, and experimentally digested, its sacred contents. And now, in their more particular and accurate consideration, he again *digested it*, and again *tasted its*

try, tournaments, and troubadours. In 1817 it was made the meeting-place of a number of German students, congregated to celebrate the tercentenary of the Reformation.

¹ 1521—1522.

² It has been noted already that though there were various German versions of the Bible before Luther’s, printed at Nuremberg in 1477, 1483, 1490, and at Augsburg in 1518, yet they were neither permitted to be read, not readable, on account alike of the badness of the translation and badness of the printing. So Seckendorf i. 204. See Note 2 p. 90.

³ In his answer to Latomus, he says; “I grudge the time spent in reading and answering this worthless publication; particularly as I was employed in translating the Epistles and Gospels into our own language.” Again; “You can scarce believe with what reluctance I have been diverted by it from the quiet study of the Scriptures in this *Patmos*.” Milner 766, 768.

sweetness:¹ just like other translators of kindred spirit, both before, and with, and after him.² However bitter the consequences of preaching it, (and bitter indeed he afterwards found them,³) it was now with him just as with St. John himself, when having received the Little Book from the Angel, he ate it, and found it in his mouth *sweet as honey*.

Then “the Angel said, *Thou must prophesy again.*” It was with a view to *Christian Ministers* digesting, like himself, and preaching the Gospel, as well as to the people generally reading it, that Luther in fact urged on his translation of the New Testament. For full well did he recognize this,—that gospel-preaching was still instrumentally the power of God unto salvation,—that to its long neglect and interruption through the dark ages was very principally owing the establishment of the great antichristian apostacy in Christendom.—that by its renewal (mark the word, “*Prophesy again,*”) the power of apostacy was to be partially and primarily broken, according to prophecy,—and that on them, the ordained ministers of Christ, who had been enlightened to seek a Reformation, the obligation specially lay of accomplishing it. Could the Pope’s official annulment of their ministerial orders either cancel those orders, or alter the obligation consequent? the act of Antichrist cancel a

¹ For the Scripture use of the figure elsewhere see Note 2 p. 146 *suprà*. It is a figure used also by other authors. So, for example, Clemens Alexandrinus; Της Ἑλληνικῆς φιλοσοφίας, καθάπερ των καρῶν, ου το παν εδωδιμον. Strom.

² Before him, as by Waldo and Wicliff:—with him, as by Melancthon, who soon joined Luther in the translation of the Bible:—after him, as in the case of Henry Martyn, for example, while occupied in his Hindoostanee and Persian translations. “What” said he, “do I not owe the Lord for permitting me to take a part in the translation of his word! Never did I see such wonders, wisdom, and love in the blessed book, as since I was obliged to study every expression.” Life p. 271. —And let me instance too Martyn’s friend, Dr. Buchanan. While detailing to a friend, just a little before his death, the laborious plan pursued by him of a five times repeated revision of the Syriac Testament, on its reprinting, he said with emotion even to tears: “At first I was disposed to shrink from the task as irksome: and apprehended that I should find even the Scriptures pall by the frequency of this critical examination. But so far from it, every fresh perusal seemed to throw fresh light on the word of God, and to convey additional joy and consolation to my mind.” Pearson’s Memoirs, ii, 362.

³ “If I should write of the heavy burden of a godly Preacher, which he must carry and endure, as I know by my own experience, I should scare every man from the office of preaching.” Luther’s Table Talk, i, 419. So also p. 405, 6, &c.

commission which, traced upwards to its source, not he but Christ himself had communicated? Strong as was his sense of the necessity of a proper commission to the ministerial office,¹ and of the duty of ecclesiastical order, such a conclusion was impossible. Nor again, notwithstanding all his deference to “the powers that were,” could the Emperor’s interdict move him on that point; convinced as he was that God’s word might not be bound by any earthly potentate. Hence after the issuing of the Decree of Worms, and when himself confined in Patmos, he recognized the voice of duty, and stimulated Melancthon and his coadjutors at Wittemberg to the continued exercise of *evangelic preaching*,² just as if there had been no Papal revocation of their orders, or Imperial interdict against their preaching:—in other words he urged upon the reforming ministers, *at this momentous crisis of their insulation from the Romish Church and Empire*, the fulfilment of what the Angel’s injunction prefigured in vision, “Thou must prophesy again!” And though, as regarded himself *personally*, both regard to the Elector’s kindly mandate,³ and the fear of rushing *uncalled by God* into danger,⁴ made him awhile resist the desire that burnt like fire in his bones,⁵ yet so soon

¹ “He who undertakes any thing,” Luther said, “without a divine call to it, seeks his own glory. For myself I was constrained to become Doctor.” Merle D’Aub. i. 195. Again, in his letter to Melancthon, on the subject of the pretended prophets, Stork, and others: “God never sent any prophet, who was not either called by proper persons, or authorised by special miracles.” Milner 780. So too in his Table Talk, i. 406.

² Milner, 770, 771.

³ See Milner, 777, 783.—The Elector’s objection against Luther’s returning, arose chiefly doubtless out of regard to Luther’s own safety; but also in part from the fear of his being himself embroiled with the Emperor, in case of Luther’s public re-appearance.

⁴ That this was one chief guiding motive, appears from what he wrote soon after to Langus, Pastor of Erfurt; “I must not come to you: it behoveth me not to tempt God by seeking dangers elsewhere:” (Milner, 789:) compared with the quotation from his Letter to the Elector given Note 3 p. 165. At the same time, reluctance to compromise the Elector no doubt had some weight with him. He writes in the same Letter to the Elector (Milner, 783); “I am well aware that my conduct is capable of being represented as causing a multitude of dangers and difficulties to your person, government, and subjects.”

⁵ To Justus Jonas he wrote; “Beseech the Lord that I may be delivered from wicked men, and a door be opened to me for the praise of the merciful Gospel of his Son.” Again to Melancthon; “I would rather burn on live coals, than live here alone, half alive and useless.” Milner, 765, 769.—Compare Jer. xx. 9; “His word was made a reproach to me. Then I said, I will not speak any

as the doubtless divinely intended objects of his seclusion had been accomplished,—so soon as he had completed that most important work of the German translation of the New Testament, which was in God's providence to be one of the mightiest assistances towards the progress of the prophesying again, and of the Reformation,—and when a crisis had arisen, in part through the bitter persecution of fellow-laborers in Germany for preaching what were called Lutheran or evangelic doctrines, in part through official hindrances to the progress of the Gospel in the Saxon Electorate itself,¹ in part through the rise of a fanatic sect called Anabaptists, who styling themselves apostles and prophets, as if inspired from heaven, were but Satan's counterfeits, raised up by him in order to bring discredit on the true,—insomuch altogether that the fulfilment by the reforming body of the Angel's injunction seemed, humanly speaking, as indeed Melancthon urged it, to depend on his returning to his post at Wittemberg,—then, as under direction of that same *voice from heaven*, and with a view to heading them in the fulfilment of this their *ministerial*, may I not say *apostolic* commission,²—he took the decisive step of returning to Wittemberg; albeit without the Elector's permission, and at the imminent risk, proscribed as it was, of his own life.³ And on the road he wrote thus to the Elector, explaining his motives: “Inevitable reasons compel me to the step: *the divine will is plain, and leaves me no choice*: the Gospel is oppressed, and begins to labor.” Adding, with allusion not so much to the significant rite of his formal

more in his name. But his word was in my heart as a burning fire, shut up in my bones; and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay.”

¹ The Elector, although the protector of the Reformers against the execution of the Decree of Worms, yet prohibited them for preaching or disputing publicly on questions which might offend the adherents of that which was still, even there, the *established* religion.

² I may observe that the necessity was not unlike that which (as Ambrosius Ansbertus hints in his parallelism) arose out of the spread at Ephesus of the Cerinthian and Ebionite heresies for the return of *St. John*, after *his* year of exile in Patmos. See the quotation, p. 148 *suprà*.

³ So in his Letter to the Elector: “I have reason every hour to expect a violent death, from the Imperial edicts and the Papal Thunders:”—and so also, to the same effect, in his letter to Gerbelius, written soon after his return: “I am now encompassed with no guards but those of heaven. I live in the midst of enemies who have a legal power of killing me every hour.” lb. 783, 788.

ordination as Deacon, as to the higher commissioning from above, and obligations consequent, that resulted from Christ's own opening of the Gospel to his soul; "It is not from *men* that I have *received the Gospel*, but from *heaven*, from the *Lord Jesus Christ* :¹ and henceforth I wish to reckon myself simply *his* servant, and to take the title of *Evangelist*."²—So the Rubicon was past; and the reforming gospel-ministers, with Christ's commission on their banner, constituted a body independent of, as well as separated from, Rome's ruling Antichrist.

It is scarce my present business to observe how, on his thus returning to his post at Wittenberg, and in the re-exercise of his prophesyings as *Evangelist*, under this clear commission from above, the Covenant-Angel shed upon him his blessing, and fulfilled the implied promise in his words of commissioning;—how, the effect of his preaching,³ counsel, and authority, was such as soon to restore order at Wittenberg,⁴ to put down the tumultuary outbreaks of the populace, quell the fanaticism of Carolstadt, and refute the *false* prophets and prophesyings by appeal conjointly to the written word, and the inward experience of the *true* prophet; at the same time that his intrepidity and example animated the evangelic ministers that had been depressed under persecution, and the publication of his German New Testament aided, above every other instrumentality, in the diffusion and confirmation of the Gospel. Suffice it thus briefly to suggest how the gospel cause, delivered both from the oppro-

¹ So he said elsewhere of his heavenly commission; "Christ spake unto me as He spake to St. Paul: where he saith, 'Arise and preach, and I will be with thee.'"—Table Talk, i. 407.

² "Ce n'est pas des hommes que je tiens l'Évangile, mais du ciel, de notre Seigneur Jesus Christ; et j'aurais bien pu, comme je veux faire dorenavant, m'appeler son serviteur, et prendre le titre d'Évangéliste." Michelet i. 113.

³ Milner gives an interesting abstract of his first sermon. "Once more," he began, "I am allowed to sound the Gospel in your ears: once more you may derive benefit from my exhortation. By and by death will come, and then we can do one another no good." Then followed an admirable abstract of the Christian doctrine of salvation.

⁴ Dr Schurff, who had been sent by the Elector to confer with Luther on his return, in his report to his master, praised Luther as "an Apostle and Evangelist of Christ. He said that all ranks and orders were delighted with his return; and that he was now daily in the most admirable manner teaching true doctrine, and restoring order every where." Ib. 782.

LUTHER.

AS AN AUGUSTINIAN MONK




LUTHER.

AS THE EVANGELIST & PREACHER



From Pictures by Jaegerma:

OBVERSE OF MEDAL STRUCK ON LUTHER'S BECOMING THE EVANGELIST.



From Jaegerma:



brium and the difficulties that threatened to oppress it, became thus free to advance, agreeably with the next clause in the Apocalyptic prediction, "Thou must prophesy again *before many nations and kings &c*;" as God might open the door to its progress. And precisely what we next read of in history is, how the door was thus opened, and that in many different countries. It was in 1522 that Luther returned, and resumed his work of prophesying at Wittemberg. And within the next two or three years we are told of its successful preaching (before princes as well as people) not in Germany only, but in Sweden, Denmark, Pomerania, Livonia;—in France, Belgium, Spain, and Italy also, though not so successfully;¹—and further, last-mentioned but not least, in England. We read too of translations of the Bible being made simultaneously by evangelic ministers into most of the vernacular tongues, after Luther's prototype; the first being that into Swedish by Olaus Petri: and how these ministers generally approved themselves men that, like Luther, had *tasted* of the good word of grace:—witness the example, not to be forgotten by us, of *Bilney* in England.² The prediction seemed fulfilling, "The Lord gave the word, great was the company of the preachers:"³ and, yet more particularly and exactly, that clause of the Apocalyptic prophecy that prefigured it, "Thou must prophesy again *before many people, and nations, and languages, and kings.*"

Still there remained on this head yet another point for decision:—a point essentially connected with the conti-

¹ See Milner, 797, 808—820.

² Having, when in much distress of mind, procured Erasmus' Latin Testament, which he had heard praised for its Latinity, and till when he knew not what the New Testament meant, he tells us, in his Letter to Bishop Tonsal, that he opened on a text, which at once gave comfort and healing to his wounded soul; "*This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all men to be received, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.*" Then, he says, the Scripture became to him sweeter than honey or the honey-comb. And he adds presently after: "As soon as by the grace of God I began to taste the sweets of that heavenly lesson, which no man can teach but God alone, I begged of the Lord to increase my faith; and at last desired nothing more than that I, being so comforted of Him, might be strengthened by his Spirit, to teach sinners his ways;" &c. Middleton Biograph. Evang. i. 114.

³ Psalm lxxviii. 11.

nuance of this renewed evangelic preaching ; and by far too important either for the Reformers to overlook in acting, or the Apocalyptic Interpreter in expounding.

It is obvious that in the first instance the fulfilment of the charge, “Thou must prophesy again,” embraced those only who, *already ordained in the Romish church*, had been by the Papal and Imperial decrees interdicted from preaching, and degraded from Holy Orders : in regard of whom we have seen Luther’s decisive judgment and course of acting, and that of the other Reformers associated with him.—But what of the *future*?—Cut off from the ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and without any Bishop, at least in the Saxon Electorate,¹ uniting with them, whence was to come the *subsequent ordination* of their ministers, whereby to furnish the supply necessary for the continuance of the preaching of the Gospel? The more regular apostolic constitution of christian churches, as defined in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, and moreover for ten centuries the *almost constant*,² and

¹ The Bishop Thurzo, of *Breslau in Silesia*, who died August 1529, and his successor James of Salza of the same See, are the only two Bishops noted thus far as favouring the Reformation. Milner 815.

² I thus express myself, because of the well known allowance, both in the Eastern and Western churches,—and that for some centuries,—of ordination by *Chorepiscopi*; a class whose ecclesiastical rank and character may perhaps be not unfitly resembled to that of *Archdeacons* in our church; certainly, as it seems to me, to them much more than to *Bishops* proper.

As their case has been overlooked, so far as I know, in the late controversial publications on the subject of ministerial ordination, it may perhaps be useful to subjoin a little fuller notice of them.

Originally, as Mosheim observes in his History of the Church in its first Century, they were *Suffragans* or *Deputies*, appointed by the *Bishop of a City* to instruct the societies gathered into the christian Church in the rural districts adjacent. Hence their title *Chorepiscopi, rural Bishops*; the word *Bishops* then, it must be remembered, including simple *Presbyters*.—Now the inferiority of their ecclesiastical rank to that of Bishops proper appears thus. First, it is expressed by the not unfrequent comparison of the *latter* to the *apostles*, of the *former* to the *seventy elders*.* For I conceive, the seventy elders cannot be regarded of the same rank or order as the Apostles, and so neither the *Chorepiscopi* of the same as Bishops.—Further, both the manner of *appointment* of the *Chorepiscopi* to their office, and the mode also in which they *exercised* their office, marked their inferiority. The *appointment* of his *Chorepiscopi* was made simply and alone by each city Bishop:—so we learn from the Council of Antioch: †—whereas *consecration by three Bishops* was in the Nicene Council, (recognized by that of Antioch,) declared necessary to the canonical constitution of a proper Bishop. Again,

* So in the Council of Neocæsarea, (A. D. 314) Can. 14; *χωρεπισκοποι εισιν εις τυπον των εβδομηκοντα*. Harduin i. 286.

† Held A. D. 341; Can. 10. Hard. i. 598.

afterwards *constant* practice in the Church visible, had affixed to the *episcopal order* alone the function of ordaining deacons and presbyters. Was then the future supply to remain unprovided? Was the Refor-

whereas *independency* of action characterized the Bishop, insomuch that Bingham declares the very *essence* of the episcopal order involved in it, (ii. I. 1, ii. 3, 2, &c.) it was laid down by the Council of Antioch, among others, that the *Chorepiscopi* might not ordain presbyters and deacons without the consent of the City Bishop, on pain of degradation; and, as we learn from Basil's own practice, they were obliged frequently to consult him even on the fulfilment of lesser functions.*—On all these accounts it seems clear to me that the *Chorepiscopus* was of an inferior order to the *Bishop* proper. Bingham contradicts himself, as will appear even from what has been said above, in his attempt to make them out to be of the episcopal order. As for his chief proof, drawn from a passage in Athanasius distinguishing the *Chorepiscopus* from a *Presbyter*,† the proof is valueless: because there were then not *three* clerical orders simply, as in our Reformed Churches, but *nine*; of which the four higher were *Presbyter*, *Archipresbyter*, *Chorepiscopus*, and *Bishop*: and consequently the distinguishing them from *presbyters* would not establish their equality with *Bishops*.‡ And, in fact, in the only ancient ritual (so far as I can find) in which the *Chorepiscopal* rite of ordination is given (that of the Syrian Maronites) it is followed by the rite of *Episcopal* ordination: and, in the latter the newly elected Bishop is stated to have been raised by imposition of hands from the order of *Chorepiscopus*, as from a separate and inferior one.§

The conclusion I come to is the same as *Bellarmin's*, among others, and that of the *schoolmen* and *canonists*. *Mosheim* too expresses a similar opinion. "Quod quidem genus," he says of the *Chorepiscopi*, "medium veluti inter episcopos et presbyteros interjectum erat;—inferius episcopis, superius presbyteris." ||

Such was their inferiority of order to the Bishop. Yet they *ordained*, and their ordinations were held *legitimate*.—In evidence of this, for the *earlier* centuries the reader need only consult Bingham. For the *later* centuries, he may consult Martene De Rit. ii. 12. The latter in illustration cites (besides the earlier Council of Antioch) that of Meaux, held in the year 845; also Isidore, Pope Zachary, famous in the time of Pepin, Pope Nicholas I; &c. &c. I quote the extract of the Epistle of the last mentioned Pope (whose Episcopate lasted from A. D. 858 to 867) given by Martene. It was in reply to the query of Rodulph, Archbishop of Bourges, on the subject of *Chorepiscopal* ordination. "A *Chorepiscopis* asseris multas esse in regionibus vestris ordinationes presbyterorum et diaconorum effectas; quos quidam episcoporum deponunt, quidam vero denuo consecrant. Nos vero dicimus nec innocentes oportere percelli, nec ulla debere fieri ordinationes vel iteratas consecrationes. Ad formam enim *septuaginta* *Chorepiscopi* facti sunt, quos quis dubitet episcoporum habuisse officia."—Martene endeavours to explain away the force of this by a citation from the Acts of the Cenomanensian Bishops of the time of Charlemagne, to the effect that no *Chorepiscopus* might make the *chris*m, dedicate churches, &c, much less ordain, *unless ordained by three Bishops*; "quæ omnia summis sacerdotibus, et non *chorepiscopis* debentur;" adding that

* Referred to in Bingham ii. 14. 6.

† "There needs no fuller proof that the *Chorepiscopi* were properly Bishops, than this,—that Athanasius puts a manifest distinction betwixt Presbyters and *Chorepiscopi*; saying, that the Churches of Marcotis had never had either Bishop or *Chorepiscopus* among them, but only Presbyters in their respective villages." Bingham ii. 14.4.—If we said of a certain district that it had never had either *Bishop* or *Archdeacon* residing there, but only the *Parochial Clergy*, would it prove the *Archdeacon* to be a *Bishop*? ‡ Martene ii. 1, 105.

§ "Offerimus hunc Sanctitati tuæ, qui impositionem manûs divinæ accepti ex ordine *Chorepiscopi*." Martene ii. 106. || Cent. i. 2. 2. 13.

mation to be left, like that begun more early by the *Bohemians*,¹ to dry up for want of Pastors? Could it be Christ's will that the very separation from Antichrist should involve as its consequence Antichrist's triumph?—Surely not.—In fact the case might seem to be one provided for in the original Scripture record of the first times of Christianity; not merely by the absence in it of any direct Apostolic *proscription* of other than Episcopal ordination, but by the Apostolic constitution of some of the Churches (of *Corinth*, for example,²) with but the *two* clerical orders, *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, not the *three*. Thus satisfied that both the *spirit of Scripture* countenanced the proceeding contemplated, and though not the usual *rule*, yet the *exception*, of *Apostolic practice*, Luther decided to arrange for the future independently altogether of the Romish hierarchy. He announced his judgment in a Treatise against the falsely called Ecclesiastical Orders, of Pope and Bishops;—not against true

they considered this to have been the doctrine of the Holy Fathers before them. But where do we find any such limitation in the early Fathers *before*, any more than in the expressions of Pope Nicholas himself *after*, them?—No doubt there were anciently certain cases of *επισκοποι σχολαζοντες*, Bishops regularly ordained, but, it might be, driven from their own sees; and who, in *another* Bishop's diocese, were only permitted to act as Chorepiscopi: e. g. the case of the Meletian Bishops &c, as noticed in the Council of Nice.* But these were but a few among the many. The *rule* was that of the Church of Antioch. Indeed if *regularly* consecrated as Bishops, they would have been of the order not of the *Seventy*, but of the *Twelve*.

See too on this subject of the Chorepiscopi, the fact of their often ordaining, and the general jealousy felt against them in consequence by Prelates of higher rank, Harduin i. 768, iii. 339, iv. 1314.—Both Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons in the 9th century, and Gottshalk, of whom I shall have to speak in my Chapter on the Witnesses, were *Chorepiscopi*.

¹ "Where no Preachers are all will go to the ground. . . . In this sort the Pope overcame the Bohemians, and brought them again to his bay, when they had no ministers. Then the Popish Bishops forced those that were new-ordained to hold in, and subject themselves under their command." So Luther: adding; "But we, by grace, hold the jurisdiction to ordain in our Churches &c." Table Talk, i. 417.

² The only notice, I believe, in the *New Testament* of the ecclesiastical officers in the church of Corinth, is in 1 Cor. xvi. 15; "Ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first-fruits of Achaia, and they have addicted themselves to the *ministry* of the saints: (*εις διακονιαν τοις αγιοις*) that ye submit yourselves to such; &c." Besides which in Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, (ch. 42,) written probably very soon after Domitian's persecution, there is mention only of Bishops and Deacons, i. e. Presbyters and Deacons, (*οι πρεσβυτεροι το παλαιον εκκληντο επισκοποι*: Chrysost. Hom. i. in Phil. i. 1,) as officers in the then Corinthian church. See my Note Vol. i. p. 262.

* Mosheim iv. 2. 3. 18.

Bishops, he said, but against them that oppressed the truth :—and in which, renouncing the titles of *Priest* and *Doctor*, given him originally by the Papal authorities, he styled himself simply *Preacher*.¹ This was in 1523 : about which time, I believe, a change of ministerial vestments, such as my Plate illustrates, marked the fact to the eye of the public.—A year or two after, the function of ordination was formally taken by the Reformed Churches into their own hands. In the *German Churches* it was vested in Superintendent Presbyters, chosen among themselves as a substitute for Bishops ;—in the *Swiss Churches* (which I must not leave out in this notice) simply in the Presbytery.² On the other hand in the cases of *Denmark*, *Sweden*, and *England*, it was through God's favouring Providence so ordered, that the direct episcopal succession passed into the Reformed Church, and the more regular medium of ordination was continued ; all, however, in christian harmony and fellowship with their continental sister churches of the Reformation.³—Thus was a provision made for the *permanent* fulfilment of still the same Apocalyptic commission, “Thou must prophesy again.”—Of course, on account of the departure in *some* cases from direct Episcopal ordination, and on account of the ordaining Bishops in *the other* cases being excommunicated and degraded by Rome, the cry was raised by their

¹ Milner, 795.

² See Mosheim, Cent. xvi, Part 2, chap. i.

³ The well-known xxxiiird Article of the Church of England, “Of ministering in the Congregation,” was notoriously so worded as to allow of the recognition of Ordinations in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. “It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacrament in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, *which be chosen and called to this work, by men who have public authority given to them in the congregation* to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.”—It is well known that the practice of the Reformed Church of England, through the reign of Edward VI, and the greater part of that of Elizabeth, was entirely conformable to the spirit of this Article. Ministers of the continental Reformed Churches (as Bucer) were admitted to English livings, and into the Universities ; and their ordination declared valid also by Act of Parliament, 13th Elizabeth. See Lathbury's English Episcopacy, pp. 19, 63 ; from Strype's Annals.

In Bishop Burnet's Comment on this 23rd Article, he specifically notices the case of Bishops failing in a particular christian community or kingdom,—so as was the case in the Saxon Electorate at the Reformation ; and Princes, from political caution or jealousies, objecting to their subjects going into other kingdoms for ordination.

enemies against ministers so ordained, as if in reality unordained and uncommissioned.¹ But behold in the wonderful figuration before us *God's own divinely pronounced sentence* in the matter. Supposing that the sense I have attached to the passage before us is the right one, (and, I think, considering the context in which it occurs, it will be hard indeed to disprove it,) we have in the fact of *St. John's* being made *representa-*

¹ In this I allude chiefly to Rome, and its attacks on the orders of all the Reformed Churches as invalid. It is to be lamented that some too in the Church of England should, of late years, have impugned the validity of the orders of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, because Presbyterian. Besides being contrary to the spirit of the Church of England, as judged of by its Articles, and by the doctrine and practice of its venerable founders, is it not *suicidal*? For who among the ministers of the English Church, (however positively some have asserted it,) could, *on their own principles rigidly carried out*, prove his own ordination to be valid?—The consecration of each Bishop, in order to validity, requires three Bishops; his previous admission to Priest's and Deacon's Orders, at least one more. Thus we may say the validity of but *one* Episcopal ordination involves that of 4 more; that of these 4, it might be, of 16, and of these 16, if the number of Bishops in the community allowed scope enough, and the ordaining Bishops in each line traced backward were distinct and unintermingled, that of 64. Allowing twenty years to each Bishop's episcopate on an average, we should be carried back in a century *five* steps; and therefore so as to involve the validity, *still on the same suppositions*, of 256.—Of course the number is in practice greatly and constantly lessened by the circumstance of the ordaining Bishops being in many ordinations the same. Still enough remains true of the case supposed to show that the validity of the consecrations of the *whole* preceding Episcopal body, however large, united in the same country or rather communion, would within a century or two be involved, in order to assure the validity of that of *one* Bishop now. And since before the Reformation *all Western Europe* was thus connected together, and *foreigners* continually filled the *English* Sees, it follows that we need the validity of the ordinations of *all the Bishops of Western Europe* in the 13th and earlier centuries, in order (on the principles of those I speak of) to establish our own. Thus we come necessarily not only to the consideration of the many possible *contingencies* of failure, of which Chillingworth speaks so strongly, but to the direct question, among others, of the validity of *Chorepiscopal* ordinations; which, as explained in a former Note, seem to have been by no means properly Episcopal, and were yet frequent, and practised for ages. The stream of succession, by which each English minister's ordination is traced back to its Apostolic origin, must almost necessarily include some out of the wide-spread numbers of chorepiscopally ordained presbyters; (e. g. Agobard of Lyons; persons *destitute of the necessary prerequisite*, according to our objectors, *of true priestly orders*; for ordinations *per saltum* were uncanonical and illegal. (Martene ii. 8.)

Let me add Hooker's well known passage on the subject. "There may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a Bishop. Where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath, nor can have possibly, a Bishop to ordain,—in case of such necessity the ordinary institution of God *hath* given *oftentimes*, and *may* give place. And therefore we are not simply, and without exception, to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles, by continual succession of Bishops, in every effectual Ordination." See also Bishop Stillingleet's *Eirenicum*, ch. viii. 385, to the same effect.

* See England's grievances, exhibited in the Council of Lyons A. D. 1245; "That in the benefices in England one Italian succeedeth another;" &c.

tive of the ministers of the Reformation, at this particular stage in the apocalyptic drama, a direct intimation of their being all *in the line of Apostolic succession*; and in the *Angel's* words, "Thou must prophesy again," of their being *commissioned* by HIM who commissioned the apostles,—the COVENANT-ANGEL, the LORD JESUS.

There is yet *one other* point that I must notice, ere concluding, I mean the *change* in the *ritual of Priest's ordination* now introduced by the Reformers.—The imaginary function of sacrificing being renounced as blasphemous, and that of preaching the Gospel (in conjunction with the right administration of the sacraments) considered as the grand function of the christian ministry, a corresponding change was made universally in the *verbal formula*; and instead of the words, "Receive thou authority to *sacrifice* for the living and the dead," authority was given, and a solemn charge added, to *preach the Gospel*.¹—Moreover in some of the reformed churches,² and more especially in the Anglican, there was a change in the *symbol*, as well as the *words*. Not merely was the delivery of the *chalice* and the *paten* abolished, (in which abolition all agreed,) but instead thereof there was, in the churches I allude to, the substitution (very much in accordance with that old form of Diaconal ordination already spoken of) of the delivery of what I conceive to have been the Βιβλιαριδιον of the Apocalyptic figuration, the *Little Bible*, the *New Testament*; or perhaps the whole *Bible*,³ now through the art of printing (and the fact was most important) made a *small book*. We find it appointed in the English formulary that the candidate for *Deacon's*

¹ The contrast is thus drawn by Luther in his Table Talk, ii. 22. "In the Popedom they invest priests, not for the preaching and teaching God's word, but to celebrate mass, &c. For when a Bishop ordaineth, he saith, Take power to celebrate mass, and to offer for the living and the dead! But we ordain Priests, according to the command of Christ, to preach the pure gospel and God's word."

See too on this subject an interesting extract given by Seckendorf, Book iii. pp. 499, 500, from a Sermon by George Prince of Anhalt.

In the Swedish Church it was decreed that none should be ordained who did not approve themselves both *able* and *willing* to preach the Gospel. Milner, 813.

² The symbol is used in some of the Lutheran Churches, in others not.

³ The circumstance of the *New Testament* and the *Bible* being thus used in the Ordinations of the Churches of the Reformation, is another example of the Apocalyptic habit of borrowing figures from habits established at the time; at

Orders shall, on his ordination, have the *New Testament* given into his hands by the ordaining Bishop, and the candidate for *Priest's Orders* the *Bible*: the words of commission accompanying being in the one case, "Take thou authority to *read the Gospel* in the Church of God, and to *preach the same*, if licensed by the Bishop;" in the other, "Take thou authority to *preach the word*;" with an additional authorization for administering the Sacraments. Yet again, in the consecration of *Bishops*, it was judged fit that the same significant symbol should not be omitted. The Archbishop delivers the *Bible* in this case into the hand of him that has been consecrated; ¹ with the injunction, "Take heed to the doctrine and exhortation! Think on the things contained in this Book!"—Thus, in each of the three cases, considering that the ordaining or consecrating Bishop acts in the ceremony as *Christ's deputy*, there remains in our English ritual (and the same for the most part in other reformed rituals) the perpetuation, substantially, of the Apocalyptic prefiguration of the commissioning of the ministers of the Reformation.—Surely the fact is most remarkable. Nor I think, will it be either uninteresting or profitless to the ministers ordained, even now, on each such solemn occasion to remember this prototype of their ordination, pre-enacted in the visions of Patmos. Besides the strength and comfort derivable (especially in seasons of tasting the bitterness of the ministerial work) from the view that it presents of the COVENANT-ANGEL as having commissioned them, ² it

the same time that it is one accordant both with more ancient usages, as we have seen, in the Christian Church, and with the symbols in the Old Testament scripture.

It is observable that many manuscripts read *Βιβλιον*, not *Βιβλιαριδιον*. At the same time there is a decided preponderance of evidence in favor of the latter reading, as may be seen in Griesbach: And therefore it seems right to receive it as the right one.

¹ This appears from the *ancient* rituals to have been *anciently* a customary form in *Episcopal* ordination, in some churches. The circumstance of the Bishop being then distinctively the *Preacher*, will sufficiently account for this distinction.

² "When those that are in the office of teaching have not joy or comfort from thence, it is that they have not regard to Him that called and sent them. I would not take the wealth of the world, that I should now begin to work against the Pope, when regarding the exceeding heavy care and anguish wherewith I have been burthened. But when I look on Him that called me thereto, I would not for the world's wealth but that I had begun it." Luther's Table Talk; ii. 353.

will serve to remind them also of his intention that they should make the GOSPEL the grand subject both of their personal study and their public preaching : and further that, in the latter, they should witness for Him against all superstition, sin, and error ;—very specially, wherever and whenever Romish errors may again raise the head, against those of the *apostate Church* of ROME.

§ 2.—THE ECCLESIASTICAL CONSTITUTION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES, AND THEIR SEPARATION FROM THE CHURCH OF ROME.

“ And there was given me a reed like unto a rod. And the Angel said, Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and those that worship at it. And the court that is without the temple cast out, and measure it not ; for it has been given to the Gentiles.” Apoc. xi. 1, 2.

The division made between this and the preceding Chapter of the Apocalypse seems to me peculiarly unfortunate. For the connection between what concludes the one and what begins the other is as close as it well could be : seeing that the Angel which before addressed St. John still continues here to address him ; and the new injunction that he gives, “ Rise and measure the temple,” is but, as we shall see, a sequel to his previous injunction, “ Thou must prophesy again.” Yet this arbitrary division, this artificial break, has exercised, I am persuaded, no little influence on many modern commentators ; and,—together with the misapprehension respecting the *Little Book*, as if it were a part of the seven-sealed Apocalyptic Book, and that respecting the *prophesying*, as if it meant the enunciation of that supposed new Part of the Apocalyptic prophecy,—concurrent to make them construe the whole vision of the xth Chapter, as if it were an interruption to the previous conti-

nunity of prefiguration of things future, and a mere parenthesis of introduction to quite a new subject beginning in Chap. xi.¹—I mention this because, where a mistake of importance has been frequent and general, it can scarce fail of being instructive to an enquirer to mark its various causes and its origin.

“And the Angel said, Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar (or altar-court)² and them that worship therein.”—In my introductory Chapter on the *Apocalyptic scenery*³ it was observed that the *Temple* (the same that continued ever present before St. John, with its triple divisions, as the standing foreground of the scenery) was, agreeably with the Apostle’s own application of the figure, to be considered symbolic of the *Christian Church Universal*: the *Holy of Holies* and its company representing that part of it, and their blessed state and worship, that might have been already gathered into *Paradise*;—the *remainder of the temple*, and those worshipping therein, the church on *earth* and its worship. It was further observed respecting this its remainder, including the Holy Place and the altar-court, that the *Holy Place*, being that which was concealed with its candlestick and incense-altar from general view in the *Jewish Temple*, and that wherewith in the *Apocalyptic Temple* the great High Priest (the same that walks in the midst of the golden candlesticks) alone appeared conversant, might be regarded as figuring the Church in respect of its *secret spiritual worship and character*, unseen by men, but marked by Jesus: on the other hand the *altar-*

¹ See the observations at pp. 43—46 *suprà*.—In a Paper in the Investigator, signed T. C. C. Vol. iii, p. 145, the continuity of these two Chapters, the xth and xith, is strongly insisted on. This is the earliest notice of it that I remember to have seen: and, as it happened, was inserted just about the same time as a Paper of my own on the Witnesses, (printed p. 185 of the same Volume,) at the conclusion of which the same view was expressed incidentally.

² The preposition *in*, “them that worship *in* it,” seems to make it proper to translate the word *θυσιαστηριον* *altar-court*. So it is used by Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, c. 5, and Epistle to the Trallians, c. 7; where “without the altar,” means “without the altar-court.” See Vol. i. pp. 17, 18. Compare Apoc. xiv. 18, xvi. 7.

³ See Vol. i. pp. 98, 100.

court and they that worshipped in it, (for the *worshippers' court* is viewed Apocalyptically as an appendage and part of the *altar-court*),¹ as figuring the church in respect of its *visible and public worship*.—Already some illustrations of this the symbolic signification of the *altar-court* have occurred to our notice. Thus under the fifth Seal, the figuration of souls beneath the altar, slain for the testimony of Jesus, was found to correspond in history with a state of the church in which, from the virulence of persecution, no public act of Christian devotion and worship was visible in the Roman world, but that of the saints offering themselves in martyrdom, for the name, and as it were on the altar, of Christ.² Again, in the temple-scene as depicted before the first sounding of the Trumpets, and the then presentation of incense by the saints to their Angel-Priest beside the great altar, in contradistinction to others who, having forsaken the altar, presented it not,—we traced allusion to a state of the professing church in Christendom, in which but few comparatively remained true to Christ's pure faith and worship; the majority having substituted for the atoning and justifying virtue of his sacrifice other methods of justification, and for his mediatorship and intercession other mediators.³—And now that the symbolic temple is again introduced into notice, with the new feature super-added of its *outer court*, or *court of the Gentiles*,⁴ the explanation continues obvious on the same principle. The

¹ Frequently the *altar-court* and the *court of the worshippers*, or of *Israel*, are spoken of as distinct and separate; but here the inclusion of the latter in the former is implied in the words of the text, "Measure the altar, or *altar-court*, and them that worship in it." Nor is this inconsistent with the Jewish view of the matter. Vitringa, p. 595, quotes Grotius, showing that the *altar-court* and *Court of Israel* were not so separated as to be deemed by the Jews two, but one.

The symbolization of worshippers, as well as worship, by the Jewish Temple, is natural and frequent. So by St. Paul in passages referred to in my Introductory Chapter, Vol. i. p. 100. So by the early Fathers. So again by subsequent ecclesiastical writers, and indeed in the acts of Councils and Papal Bulls continually. In the Apocalypse, however, we see the *worshippers* are specified, as well as the *local scene* of worship; thus making the symbol more distinct.

² See Vol. i. pp. 179, 180.

³ *Ib.* p. 302 &c.

⁴ From Solomon's prayer on the dedication of the Temple, 1 Kings viii. 41, that the *Gentiles* might worship God there, we may infer that a *Court for the Gentiles* was then built. And thus when two Courts are mentioned afterwards, as in 2 Kings xxi. 5, xxiii. 12, &c, we may consider the same two intended as here. Compare too Jer. xxxvi. 10, where the higher court is mentioned.

altar-court, with *them that worshipped in it*, is still used as the symbol of that part of the *church visible* which (like Israel when faithful to the Mosaic law) adhered to the true and divinely instituted worship that the altar indicated. On the other hand the *outer* or *Gentile court* is the symbolic scene of the adscititious members from out of heathenism : who having called themselves christians, and been thus enrolled into the body of the New Testament Israel, had yet ere long (like backsliding Israel of old) forsaken the christian altar-worship ; and were now at length denounced by the Angel as having visibly, though not professedly, apostatized to heathenism.¹

Thus much on the *temple-scene*, and the emblematic meaning of those two different parts of it, the *altar-court* and *court of the Gentiles*. To the which let me add (in order to the connexion of the *present* with the *past*) that it would be scarce possible, as I conceive, for St. John not to view the heathenized professors of the outer court here mentioned, as of the same line of apostacy with that of the unfaithful ones described in sundry earlier and not to be forgotten notices :—the same that, having in the first instance, though under the name and profession of God's Israel, satisfied themselves with another life-giving and another sealing than that by the divine life-giving Angel from the East, and at the time of the first Trumpet-sounding been alluded to as withholding their incense from the Angel-priest, and forsaking the great altar of sacrifice,—had afterwards been figured as before the blast of the sixth Trumpet rejecting the reconciliation with Christ, offered them at the four horns of the golden altar,—and, again, after the slaying of the third part of men under that same Trumpet, as still adhering to their heathen idolatries and demon-worship :²

¹ Compare 1 Cor. v. 12, where $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \epsilon\xi\omega$, "them that are *without*," is said of the *heathen* : also Mark iv. 11, where our Lord, using the figure, says, "to them that are *without* in parables."

Tichonius, in his Homily 8 ad loc. explains the symbol very similarly. "Ipsi atrium sunt qui videntur in ecclesiâ esse, et foris sunt ; sive hæretici, sive malè viventes catholici."

² Apoc. vii. 2, viii. 3, ix. 13, 20, &c. See Vol. I. pp. 253, 302, 454, Vol. ii. p. 8, &c.

—the same, in fine, against whose usurping Head there had been recently figured the intervention and wrathful cry of the Covenant-Angel; and from whose seven-hilled metropolis, in hostile answer, there had sounded forth the seven antichristian thunders.

This premised, the meaning of the predictive clause before us, —“ Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar-court, and those that worship in it; but the court that is without the temple cast out, and measure it not, for it has been given to the Gentiles,”—will readily approve itself to the reader. It must signify that they whom St. John at this particular epoch represented, —that is Luther and his brother reforming ministers, would, as the sequel to their resumption of prophesying or gospel-preaching, 1. be directed to the *regular constitution of the Reformed Church*, (that which might now alone be rightly deemed Christ’s Church visible,¹) for the measuring implies the edification and constitution, as well as definition, of what is measured; ²—2. that they would *define*, as those who only could be considered to belong to it, such as in public profession and worship recognized that cardinal point of the Christian faith, *justification by the alone efficacy of Christ’s propitiatory sacrifice*, and *through Christ’s alone mediatorship*;—3. that they would *exclude* therewith, or *excommunicate*, (for such is the ecclesiastical force of the word,³) the

¹ That is in Roman Christendom.

² So Jerem. xxxi. 38, 39; “The *measuring line* shall yet go forth upon the hill Gareb, and shall compass about to Goath:” a passage preceded by the words, “The city shall be built to the Lord, from the tower of Hananeel unto the gate of the corner.” So also Ezek. xl. 3, 5, &c; “Behold a man with a *line of flux* in his hand, and a measuring reed:” on which follows the account of the rebuilding of the temple and city in vision. The same in Zech. ii. 1, &c. “I looked, and behold a man with a *measuring line* in his hand. Then said I, Whither goest thou? And he said unto me, to measure Jerusalem; to see what is the breadth and what is the length thereof.—And an angel said, Jerusalem shall be inhabited as towns without walls, &c.”—In 2 Sam. viii. 2, we have an example of measurement to mark out what was to be *cast out*, as well as what to be *preserved*: “He measured them with a line;—with two lines, &c. to *destroy*, and with one to *preserve alive*.” So too Lam. ii. 8.

³ “The court without the temple *cast out!*” *εκβαλε εξω* (For though without the *ναος*, it was within the *ιερον*, and so might be cast out.) The phrase is used of *Jewish* ecclesiastical excommunication, John ix. 22, 34, xii. 42, xvi. 2; as also in Matt. xxi. 12, of Christ’s casting the money-changers, &c., out of the temple:—also of *Christian* ecclesiastical excommunication, 3 John 10; where it said of Diotrophes, *εκ της εκκλησιας εκβαλλει*, “He casteth certain out

Romish Church, as apostate and heathen ;—4th, that, in order to these important acts, a certain *ecclesiastical authority* would be officially given them : it being said, “ there was given me a reed¹ like unto a rod,” with which to measure ; and both the more usual scripture use of the word *rod*, and fact of this use being here absolutely necessary, in order to the words having any force at all, (for what could be the use of resembling the measuring reed to a simple *stick* or *staff* ?) indicating that that same *official rod* was intended by the word, which was the badge of *ecclesiastical* or *civil authority*.²—It remains to show the fulfilment of these *four* several points, in the further history of the Reformation. Let me however just premise before so doing, that with the same marvellous appropriateness of symbol that we have seen exemplified both in our last chapter, and, almost uniformly before, alike the figure of *putting a rod into*

of the Church.”—So afterwards in the Greek Councils ; Εξω βαλε Ξευρον, τον νεον Ιωδαν εξω βαλε. Hard. ii. 1333, 1335.

¹ *καλαμος*. The *reed* is mentioned as an instrument used for measurement, as well as the *measuring line*, in the passage from Ezekiel, quoted Note 2, p. 179. And the context determines it, I conceive, to have that literal meaning here.*

Compare its use Apoc. xxi. 15 : where the Angel had a *golden reed* to measure the heavenly Jerusalem ; as a city built and constituted for the saints in divine grace and love.

² *ραβδος*, the original for the word *rod*, is used twelve times, I believe, in the New Testament. In four of these it means a *walking staff* : viz. in those passages of the three Evangelists which narrate Christ's charge to his apostles not to take scrip or *staff* ; and perhaps also in Heb. xi. 21, where Jacob is said to have “ worshipped, leaning on the top of his *staff*.” In the other nine it is used

* A second literal meaning is attached to this word *καλαμος* by the early Commentator *Primasius*, viz. that of a *pen* ; (being the same as its use in 3 John, 13 :) “ Evangelium quippe *arundinis* officio scribitur.” (B. P. M. x. 313). A view this not unsuitable to the case we are considering : seeing that it was by the Reformer's *pen* that the ritual and laws of the Evangelic Church were drawn up ; as also the Articles and Confessions of Faith, whereby the Orthodox Church was defined, and the Romish cast out.—I am reminded by it of the relation in Merle d'Aubigne's History of Luther, Vol. I. p. 258, of the Elector Frederic's dream, on the night before that memorable *All Saints' Day* of 1517, on which Luther posted up his Theses against Indulgences : a dream in which a monk appeared to him to write something on the walls of the great Church of Wittenberg, with a *pen* so long that it reached to *Rome* ; and which made the Pope of Rome himself, who vainly tried to break it, tremble.—The following Epitaph on Luther, by the celebrated Beza, is to the same point ; (Middleton's Biograph. Evan. i. 229 :)
Roma orbem domuit ;—Romam sibi Papa subegit :

Viribus illa suis, fraudibus ille suis.
Quanto isto major Lutherus, major et illâ,

Istum illamque uno qui domuit calamo.
I nunc ! Alciden memorato Græciæ mendax ;
Lutheri ad calamum ferrea clava nihil.

in our last chapter, and almost uniform before, alike the figure of *casting out from a temple's enclosure*, and that of *putting a rod into the hand*, will be found to have been symbols still used in Christendom, at the time referred to, (as well as by Jews, Christians, and Romans, at the time of St. John,) to signify the things and actings that I have here explained them to mean. See the proof below.¹

And now then for the historical fulfilment.—It has been already noted, that up to the time of Luther's leaving his Patmos in March 1522 to resume, despite of the Papal and Imperial interdicts, his ministerial functions of preaching, the *established* religion in Saxony, as every where else, was still the *Romish Papal* religion.² So much was this the case, that when the reforming ministers at Wittenberg, conjointly with certain commissioners of inquiry appointed by the Elector Frederick,

Jacob is said to have "worshipped leaning on the top of his staff." In the other nine it is used for a *rod of magistracy or power*. So in the Apocalypse itself, "He shall rule them with an *iron* sceptre or rod," the opposite to the golden sceptre of mercy; ii. 27: also xii. 5, xix. 15. Similarly in Acts xvi. 35, 38, *ραβδος* means a *rod-bearer* in the sense of a *magistrate's* rod-bearer.

In the Old Testament we find the word similarly used Numb. xvii. 2, 3, &c; where each prince or chief of a tribe was commanded to bring it, as the ensign of his tribe. This was the earliest use of the ensign.—In Esther iv. 11, v. 2, the word is used of the Persian king's golden rod or sceptre; *πλην ὧ εαν εκτεινη την χρυσην ραβδον* "sceptrum aureum," says Schleusner.—And so Homer's *σκηπτροχοι βασιλεις*.

¹ First, the *casting out of a temple or church enclosure*, to signify *excommunication*.—In Martene ii. p. 322 we find given sundry solemn forms of excommunication, used in the Romish Church: and in some of them the expression occurs, among others, "et à liminibus sanctæ matris ecclesiæ excludimus;" or, as another formula has it, "à liminibus sanctæ Dei ceclesiæ segregamus, et à cætu Christianorum ejicimus." And the following is described as the *action* expressing the same, in a Council of the Middle Age; viz. the Concilium Lemovicense held A. D. 1031: that when any one was excommunicated the Bishop should go publicly to the door of the church, and shut him out; "ostium pro eo claudat." Hard. vi. l. 884.—So again in the Council of Nismes, A. D. 1284; where it is directed that the secular officers be called on to expel each *excommunicate* out of the churches, and elsewhere. Harduin, vii. 907, 922.

Secondly, in Martene the giving the *virga*, or *sceptrum*, is noted in the usual ceremonies of imperial or regal inauguration, as symbolizing the communication of civil execution and judicial power. So Tom. ii. p. 218 of the inauguration of the French King: "Tunc detur ei *virga*," with the accompanying words; "Accipe virgam virtutis et æquitatis, quâ intelligas mulcere pios et terere reprobos." And so again in the Ordo vi, for the Emperor; where it is said to be a "*virga* ad mensuram unius cubiti, vel amplius," with an *ivory* handle, and called a *sceptrum*, as well as *virga*. lb. 220, 221.—In the Pope's inauguration too a *ferula*, or *ραβδος*, is given, as "*ferula* quæ est signum correctionis et regiminis." lb. ii. 82.

² See p. 165 Note 1 *suprà*.

began to take steps for the abolition of some of the more prominent superstitions of the Papacy, the Elector declared that they had exceeded their orders, and might embroil him with the Romish prelates and the Emperor. Nor indeed did Luther as yet wish much more from the civil power, than the freedom of evangelic preaching.¹ His idea was that through this simple preaching of the gospel, uninforced by any further act of the civil power, the Papacy, which was to be broken *without hand*, would fall into ruins. Hence, with reference to the state of things at the end of 1522, the following is the historian's observation: "Thus in Divine Providence the foundation of the Reformation had been laid in Germany by preaching and the exposition of God's word; with *no more aid from the civil power* than that of a connivance firm indeed and unalterable, yet ever betraying the marks of hesitation and indecision."² The *ῥαβδος*, or *rod of civil power*, had not yet been given to the reformers; to authorize their proceeding to any regular constitution and definition of the reformed Church.

Now mark the observation that follows almost immediately on the one last quoted. "But the difficulty of providing for the *instruction* and *edification* of the Lutheran churches began to be now more and more apparent. It was not possible that public worship, and the administration of the sacraments, could be conducted decently and in order, without some plan of ecclesiastical discipline. The great personal authority of Luther seemed to be the only cement of union among those that loved the gospel. Hence what feuds and divisions might arise! And there was no opportunity of forming a general synod of pastors and elders who might regulate the external state of religion."³ It is of the state of things in the year 1523 that Milner is here speaking.—In the Providence of God many of the old canons of Wittenberg having died about this time, the revenues of their canonries fell in: and so the execution of one part of Luther's plan was facilitated; I mean that of forming out of them

¹ Milner, 775—778, 781.

² Ib. 789.

³ Ib. 790.

a common treasury, as he called it, for the support of ministers, as also of schools and hospitals. Still the authority was not given; the plan remained unexecuted. At length, after another year or little more, the Elector Frederic, thoroughly convinced that the Reformation was accordant with God's mind and will, determined on taking bolder steps, and giving his authority for the ecclesiastical organization of the Reformed Churches. But he was now sinking under age and infirmities, and died before it was done.—“No sooner however,” says Milner, “did the Elector John (Frederic's brother) find himself in possession of the sovereign authority, than,” assuming to himself that supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, which according to the Reformers, alike in Germany Switzerland and England, was the natural right of every lawful sovereign,¹ “he exercised it with resolution and activity by forming *new ecclesiastical constitutions*, modelled on the principles of the great Reformer.”² The prefiguration was fulfilled, “There was given me a measuring reed *like unto a rod* ;” and the Reformers *rose up*³ in their strength to make the measurement.—The account follows in history of the execution of this most important commission assigned them of *measuring*, or *ecclesiastically constituting*, what was called the *Evangelic Church*,⁴ the mystic temple :—of the authorization

¹ Hæweis, in his Continuation of Milner p. 991, observes: “Luther had given the civil magistrate the supreme power in ecclesiastical regulations, and Zwinglius therein concurred with him.” So too in the Article xxxvii of our Anglican Church; where the doctrine is carefully exprest and guarded.

² Milner 894; Mosheim xvi. 1. 2. 23.

³ *εγείραι*, *Rise or wake up!* The expression implies vigorous and decisive action after inertness, and success after depression. So Numb. xxiii. 24; Is. li. 9. &c.—A very parallel example to that before us occurs in Nehemiah ii. 17, 18; “Ye see the distress we are in; how Jerusalem lieth waste: come and let us build the wall of Jerusalem, that we be no more a reproach! Then I told them of the hand of my God which was good upon me; as also the king's words that he had spoken unto me. And they said, Let us *rise up* and *build*. So they strengthened themselves for this good work.”—Milner, p. 894, observes on the occasion; “John was convinced that to temporize much longer with a corrupt and unprincipled hierarchy might prove fatal to the good cause. An appeal had been made to reason, and reason decided in a manner that had astonished all Europe. This astonishment was therefore to be *roused to action*,” &c.

⁴ “This,” says Mosheim, (*viz. Evangelical*), “was the title assumed by that Church, (the Lutheran,) in consequence of the original design of its founders, which was to restore to its native lustre the gospel of Christ, that had so long been covered with the darkness of superstition; in other words, to place in its

and introduction throughout the Saxon churches of new formularies of public worship, drawn on evangetic principles by Luther and Melancthon,—of the removal from the church and church-worship of Romish images and superstitions,—of the appropriation of the ecclesiastical revenues of the Electorate to the support of the *reformed* parochial clergy and schools,—and of the ordination, independently altogether of the Romish Hierarchy, (the same to which I alluded at the close of the former Section,) of a fresh supply of ministers of the Gospel. All this was effected in the autumn of 1525.¹ And somewhat later, viz. in the years 1527, 1528, a general visitation of the Electorate, by Luther and other of the Reforming Fathers, was made on the Prince's order; to see to the execution of the new system, and complete what might be wanting to the *ecclesiastical establishment* (oh wonderful consummation!) of a *separate evangetic Church*.²

In all of which regulations the example of Saxony was followed *pari passu* by the other reforming States already noticed, in Germany, Denmark, Sweden,³ and afterwards England: the *παβδος* of the civil authorities being given for this purpose to the reforming ministers; without which the probability is that the reformed churches would have soon fallen into misrule and anarchy.⁴ And what we

proper and true light that important doctrine which represents salvation as attainable by the merits of Christ alone.' (xvi. 2. 1. 1.)—It was indeed in the spirit of the *Little Book*, or *New Testament of the Gospel of Christ*, that every step was taken in the Reformation.

The Church was afterwards called *Lutheran*. But this was quite contrary to Luther's own wish. In his Warning against Sedition and Tumult, he exhorts all men not so much as to mention his name, or call themselves *Lutherans*, but *Christians*. "The doctrine," he says, "is not mine, nor was I crucified for any one. Paul and Peter forbade his people to call themselves after their names. Why should I, who am so soon to be food for worms, desire the children of Christ to be called by mine? No! Let us be called *Christians*, because we possess the doctrine of Christianity." He adds; "The *Papists* have very properly another name, because they are not content with Christ's name and Christ's doctrine. They choose to be called *Papists*." Milner 787.

¹ Junckner, p. 64, notices the first Lutheran *ordination* as made in this year. The date of this important step is not given either by Milner or Mosheim.

² Milner, p. 937.

³ *Ibid.* p. 808—814.—The same too may be said of *Switzerland*. See Mosheim, xvi. 2. 2, 3, &c.

⁴ So Schlegel, *Philosophy of History* ii. 214; "It was by the influence Luther

are here called on, by the Apocalyptic prefiguration, further and specially to notice, is this ;—that the principle acted on in them all was precisely the same as that laid down by the Angel in vision for the symbolic measurement of the Apocalyptic temple : viz. to make salvation through Christ's meritorious death and mediatorship, (that which the *altar* of the Jewish temple symbolized,) the prominent characteristic of the worship of the newly reformed church ; and to exclude those who (having forsaken the altar) had made to themselves another method of salvation, and given themselves up to heathen superstitions and idolatries ;—in other words, the worshipping professors in the apostate pseudo-church of Rome. Charged by the Papists as *schismatics*, the principle was solemnly avowed and justified before the world. At the first Diet of Augsburg, held A. D. 1525, just while this reformation of the Church was in progress, an Apology was delivered in by the Elector, written by Melancthon ; and in which the following points were insisted on :¹—1st, that every minister of God's word is bound by Christ's express precept to preach² the leading doctrine of the gospel, *justification by faith in Christ crucified*,³ and not by the merit of human performances ; whereas men had by the Romish doctrines been drawn from the cross of Christ,⁴ to trust in their own works and superstitious vanities :—2ndly, that it became the Princes, (those over whom the Pope and the Bishops had exercised hitherto a usurped authority, but to whom the authority in these matters rightfully belonged,⁵) simply to consider whether the *new doctrines*, as they were called, were or were not *true* ; and if true, to protect and promote them :⁶—3rdly, that the Roman Pope, Cardinals, and Clergy,

thus acquired, (viz. by asserting the king's authority,) and by *the sanction of the civil power* that the Reformation was promoted and consolidated. Without this, Protestantism would have sunk into the lawless anarchy which marked the proceedings of the Hussites."

¹ See Milner, p. 916, whose words I chiefly use in what follows.

² "The Angel said, Thou must *prophesy* again."

³ That which the *altar-worship* signified.

⁴ Drawn away from the *altar-Court* to the *Court without the Temple*.

⁵ The *ῥαβδος*, the *rod of civil authority*.

⁶ "A reed was given me *like a rod*, saying, Rise and measure," &c.

did not constitute the *Church of Christ*,¹ though there existed among them some that were real members of that Church, and opposed the reigning errors; that the true Church consisted of the faithful, and none else, who had the word of God, and by it were sanctified and cleansed:—on the other hand that what St. Paul had predicted of *Antichrist* coming, and *sitting in the temple of God*, had had its fulfilment in the Papacy: which being so, and God having forbidden under the heaviest penalty every species of idolatry and false worship, of which class were the sacrifice of the mass, masses for the dead, invocations of saints, and such like,—things notoriously taught in the Church of Rome,—that they were not guilty of schism, either because they had convicted Antichrist of his errors, or made alterations in their church-worship and regulations, whereby the Romish superstitions were cast out.—Such was the Manifesto of the Reformers, if I may so call it, in the *first* Diet of Augsburg. In the *second* and more important Diet, held there in 1530, after the completion of the re-formation of the Church in the countries already particularized, the same principles were asserted in the celebrated *Confessions of Faith* then presented to the Diet and the Emperor, and which may be regarded as standards of the Churches;—the *Lutheran* Confession of Augsburg,—the *Swiss*,—and the *Tetrapolitan*.² Differing, as these Confessions might do, in matters of doctrine and of discipline unessential and *comparatively* unimportant,³—and the same may be said of the *English*

¹ The mystic temple, the sanctuarium Dei.

Luther, says Mosheim, when separated from Rome still regarded herself as in the *Catholic Church*, xvi. 1. 2. 14. To Pope Leo he said, “Such a universal Church (as the Romish) Augustine would have called a Synagogue of Satan.”

² The Lutheran was drawn up by *Melancthon*; the Swiss by *Zuingle*; the Tetrapolitan, adopted by Strasburgh and three other cities, by *Bucer*.—The Helvetic Confession speaks thus of the difference of the ministers of the church reformed, and the excommunicated Church of Rome. “Diversisimum sacerdotium et ministerium. Illud Christianis omnibus commune: hoc non item. Nec à medio sustulimus ecclesie ministerium, quando *repudiavimus ex ecclesiâ Christi sacerdotium Papisticum*.” Chap. xviii. p. 67 in the *Sylloge Confessionum*. (Oxon.)—Would that the *word*, as well as *office of priest*, had been abandoned by our Reformers to the heathens and the Romanists; and the New Testament term *presbyter* adopted instead!

³ Of course I mean only *comparatively*.

Confession, or Articles of faith, drawn up a few years after,¹—yet on the three points inculcated in the Apocalyptic vision upon him that represented them, the Reformers were altogether agreed; viz. in charging the *preaching of the Gospel* on their ministers, and declaring their fulfilment of this function essential to the right constitution of a Christian Church,—in setting forth *justification by faith in a crucified, risen, and mediating Saviour* as the only true method of salvation,—and in *separating themselves from the Romish Church, as a body excommunicate from Christ's true Church* and apostate.²

Wonderful and blessed consummation! I must again repeat the exclamation. Has it not by some been said that the religion of Protestantism is a mere *negation*? Oh foolish and false insinuation! If ever the reader hear the charge, let him but remember the Apocalyptic figuration of it just expounded;—a figuration not merely *excluding*, but *including*: and only so excluding what was *antichristian*, as was essential in order to the inclusion of all that is holy, Christian, and true!

Such was the *ecclesiastical constitution and establishment* of the Reformed Evangelic Churches; and with it concludes the *second grand epoch* of what, in exact accordance with the Apocalyptic emblem before us, has been called the *re-formation, or new constitution*, of the Church.³—It only remains, ere concluding this

¹ Including the *Homilies*, as being united to the Articles by the authorization of them in Art. xxxv.

² See generally the *Sylloge Confessionum*, published at Oxford.

³ Mosheim too (Cent. xvi. Sect. iii. P. ii. § 1.) marks this as the second great epoch of the Reformation. For he says *three æras* were chiefly notable in it; the *first* that of Luther and the other Reformers' excommunication by Pope Leo, A. D. 1520: the *second*, that of the Reformed Church *appearing regularly formed*, on the presentation of its Confession at the Diet of Augsburg, A. D. 1530; the *third*, when the Protestant body was recognized as legitimate in the Empire, and independent of the Roman Pontiff, by the Treaty of Passau, A. D. 1552.—And let me here observe that in the Apocalypse *three æras* are also noted of it, which do not vary materially from those of Mosheim. The chief difference is this;—that in Mosheim the *concluding* result is mentioned alone in each case as constituting the epoch, in the Apocalypse the *prior* principles that led to such results are grouped with it. Thus its *first* æra embraces Luther's previous discovery of Christ, as well as his rejection, on the damnatory Bull or seven

Chapter, to remind the reader of what had passed at that memorable epoch shortly preceding of the Papal Antichrist's triumph at Rome, and in the Lateran, described at length in a preceding chapter :¹ and to suggest for his observation how already, on each point in which the USURPER then triumphed before Christendom, he had been signally met and counteracted before Christendom, by HIM whose place he had usurped in the Church. The *Bible* was now every where *translated* and *printed* ; respecting which (as well as all other that might be deemed dangerous books) he had commanded that, except with Papal sanction, it should not be printed.² The *gospel* was preached by hundreds, *free from the glosses of the Fathers* ; against the which preaching he had issued his solemn interdict. And, as regarded *Antichrist*, not only was he every where written and preached of, but himself the *Pope* denounced as Antichrist ; — and the *day of judgment* held forth to men's view, as a day certain, and fixed, and quickly coming, which would terminate the Papal reign and power. Finally, as he had then solemnly *excommunicated* from the Church all that might dare to withhold allegiance from the Papacy and Rome, so was he now, together with his retainers and the whole Papal system, excommunicated by the Reformers, and cast out from the true Christ of Christ.³

Thunders issuing, of the Papal Antichrist : its *second*, the renewal of gospel-preaching, after Rome's excommunication, by the Reformers, and regular constitution of the Reformed Churches, completed by the Confession given in at Augsburg : its *third*, (prefigured in the ascension of the Witnesses,) the political elevation of the Protestants, begun in the Confederacy of Smalcald, completed in the Treaty of Passau.—I think no one versed in the History can fail of being struck with the admirable distinctness and completeness of this Apocalyptic arrangement. To myself its superiority to Mosheim's appears striking.

¹ See pp. 85—87, and the Chapter of which those pages form the conclusion.

² The sufficiency of this Decree of the Lateran Council, as applicable to the printing of Bibles, was noted in the Council of Trent. See Fra Paolo's History, p. 151 ; English Edition.

³ We may contrast too the *εγείρειται*, *Rise up*, in this prefiguration of their excommunication of Rome, with the "*Rise up* Peter and Paul, and all the assembly of the Saints, &c," with which Leo's famous Bull of Excommunication had commenced against Luther and the other reformers. See Foxe, v. 660.—Also the terms of the Apocalyptic with those of the Papal Excommunication. "*Veniant super illos omnes maledictiones quibus Deus illos maledixit, qui dixerint Domino Deo, Recede à nobis, scientiam, viarum tuarum nolumus ; et dixerint hereditati, Possideamus sanctuarium Dei.*" Martene, ii. 322.

the hand, and that of casting out from a temple's enclosure, will be found to have been symbols used in Christendom, both before and at the time referred to ; (as well as by Jews, Christians, and Romans, at the time of St. John ;) to signify the things and the actings that I have explained them to mean.¹

And now then for the historical fulfilment.—It has been already noted, that up to the time of Luther's leaving his Patmos in March 1522 to resume, despite of the Papal and Imperial interdicts, his ministerial functions of preaching, the established religion in Saxony, as well as every where else, was still the *Romish Papal* religion.²

for a rod of magistracy or power. So in the Apocalypse itself, ii. 27, "He shall rule them with an iron sceptre or rod;" the opposite to the golden sceptre of mercy: also Apoc. xii. 5, xix. 15; and again 1 Cor. iv. 21.—In Acts xvi. 35, 38, *ραβδευχος* means a rod-bearer, in the sense of a magistrate's rod-bearer.

In the Old Testament, after God's own consecration of the symbol in the case of Moses and Aaron, Ex. iv. 2, 17, vii. 9, we find notice of the rod in Numb. xvii. 2, 3, &c; where each prince or chief of a tribe was commanded to bring it, as the ensign of his tribe. This was the earliest use of the ensign.—In Esther iv. 11, v. 2, the word is used of the Persian king's golden rod or sceptre; *πλην ὡ εαν εκτειρη την χρυσην ραβδον* "sceptrum aureum," says Schleusner.—And so Homer's *σκηπτεχοι βασιλεις*.

¹ First, in Martene de Rit. the giving the *baculus, virga, or sceptrum*, is noted in the ceremonials of episcopal, as well as of regal inauguration; as symbolizing the communication of the necessary executive and judicial power. So Tom. ii. 73, where the Pontifex ordaining gives to the Bishop elect the *baculum episcopalem*: addressing him with the words; "Accipe baculum pastoralis officii; ut sis in corrigendis vitiis piè sæviens, judicium sine irâ tenens, in fovendis virtutibus auditorum animos demulcens, in tranquillitate severitatis censuram non deserens." So too of an Abbot, ib. p. 150; and, p. 89, "signum correctionis et regiminis," of the Pope. Accordingly, p. 318, on the degradation of a Bishop, this *baculus, or virga pastoralis*, is described as broken over his head.—At pp. 218, 220 we have described a similar ceremonial, on occasion of the inauguration of the French King, and Emperor: in which last case it is said to be a "*virga ad mensuram unius cubiti vel amplius*," with an ivory handle; and called a *sceptrum*, as well as *virga*.—In the Council of Constantinople, held A.D. 536, we read of the rod of ecclesiastical authority and office; *Την παρα τε Θεε δοθεισαν ὑμιν εξησιαν ἐπ' αυτοις κινησαντες, καθαρισατε την τε Θεε εκκλησιαν επαφεντες αυτοις, ε την ποιμαντικην, αλλα την παιδευτικην ὑμων ραβδον*. Hard. ii. 1209.

In the case of the Reformers this rod was given mediately by the civil magistrate, just as Aaron's by Moses; yet primarily by God himself.

Secondly, the casting out of a temple or church enclosure, to signify excommunication.—In Martene ii. p. 322 we find given sundry solemn forms of excommunication, used in the Romish Church: and in some of them the expression occurs, among others, "et à liminibus sanctæ matris ecclesiæ excludimus;" or, as another formula has it, "à liminibus sanctæ Dei ecclesiæ segregamus, et à cætu Christianorum ejicimus" And the following is described as the action expressing the same, in the Concilium Lemovicense, held A. D. 1031: that when any one was excommunicated, the Bishop should go publicly to the door of the church, and shut him out; "ostium pro eo claudat." Hard. vi. 1. 884.—So again in the Council of Nismes, A. D. 1284; where it is directed that the secular officers be called on to expel each excommunicated person out of the churches: and elsewhere. Ib. vii. 907, 932.

² See p. 165 Note 1 supra.

So much was this the case, that when the reforming ministers at Wittenberg, conjointly with certain commissioners of inquiry appointed by the Elector Frederick, began to take steps for the abolition of some of the more prominent superstitions of the Papacy, the Elector declared that they had exceeded their orders, and might embroil him with the Romish prelates and the Emperor. Nor indeed did Luther as yet wish much more from the civil power, than the freedom of evangelic preaching.¹ His idea was that through this simple preaching of the gospel, uninforced by any further act of the civil power, the Papacy, which was to be broken *without hand*, would fall into ruins. Hence, with reference to the state of things at the end of 1522, the following is the historian's observation: "Thus in Divine Providence the foundation of the Reformation had been laid in Germany by preaching and the exposition of God's word; with *no more aid from the civil power* than that of a connivance firm indeed and unalterable, yet ever betraying the marks of hesitation and indecision."² The *ῥαβδος*, or *rod of power*, had not yet been given to the Reformers; to authorize their regular constitution of the reformed Church.

Now mark what follows. "But the difficulty of providing for the *instruction* and *edification* of the Lutheran churches began to be now more and more apparent. It was not possible that public worship, and the administration of the sacraments, could be conducted decently and in order, without some plan of ecclesiastical discipline. The great personal authority of Luther seemed to be the only cement of union among those that loved the gospel. Hence what feuds and divisions might arise! And there was no opportunity of forming a general synod of pastors and elders, who might regulate the external state of religion."³ It is of the state of things in the year 1523 that Milner is here speaking.—In the Providence of God many of the old canons of Wittenberg having died about this time, the revenues of their canonries fell in: and so the execution of one part of Luther's plan was facilitated; I mean that of forming out of them

¹ Milner, 775—778, 781.

² *Ib.* 789.

³ *Ib.* 790.

re-formation of the Church, so presignified, (the same of which I was just speaking in the last chapter,) that the attention of the Reformers was directed retrospectively into preceding ages, to investigate the very same subject.—Of course, under their then circumstances and feelings, this was not to be wondered at. It was scarce possible but that they should anxiously and earnestly look back, to trace the origin of that antichristian apostacy which they had escaped from, and to mark who, like themselves, had previously witnessed for Christ against it. But the learning necessary for such an investigation had been hitherto greatly wanting. Now however the want was removed. As Mosheim observes,¹ it was agreed that the stability of the reformed Church depended much on the learning of her ministers;—their ecclesiastical learning, among other branches: and thus the Princes, as well as Doctors, of the Reformation encouraged it by every means, in the Academies and Universities of their kingdoms. Hence important works began now to appear, elucidatory of the subject spoken of,² more especially that of the Magdeburgh Centuriators:—of which latter work, says Mosheim, the principal author, Flacius Illyricus, may be justly called “the parent of ecclesiastical history; reflecting, as it did, a light really wonderful on the facts of the history of the Christian Church, hitherto covered with darkness, and corrupted by innumerable fables:” and of which the first specimen and precursor was that framed under the title of *CATALOGUS TESTIUM*, or *Catalogue of Witnesses*.³—And as in Germany, so in England. The venerable historiographer *Foxe* was the cotemporary of Flacius Illyricus; and busied at the very same time in the same researches. And almost in the very same year as the former work, there appeared also *Foxe’s Martyrology*: in other words, rendering the Greek

¹ Cent. xvi. ii. i. 8, 9.

² Bale’s *Image of both Churches*, spoken of in my preceding chapter, and which included retrospectively a brief catalogue of witnesses, was published A. D. 1545.

³ The associates of Flacius Illyricus in the work were Nicholaus Gallus, Johannes Wigandus, Matthias Judex, all ministers of Magdeburg, whence the name of the Work. It was published A. D. 1556.

of the Title into English, “*The History of Christ’s Martyrs and Witnesses*.¹ Really I cannot but again express my amazement at the chronological accuracy, as well as comprehensiveness and beauty of this extraordinary Prophecy. It is the sixth or seventh act in the Apocalyptic symbolism of the Reformation; and all has been found to answer, in respect of commencing date, as well as of matter, to the facts of history!

And now to the subject of the *Witnesses*.—I would observe, with reference to the *fact* here announced of Christ’s having kept up a witness for Himself during the long dark times of the apostacy preceding, that it is that of which, even independently of this direct statement, we might have felt assured. The faithful word of promise guaranteed it. In the account of the Father’s covenant with Messiah and his people, we read in Isaiah: “This is my covenant with them, saith Jehovah:² my Spirit that is upon thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of

¹ The date of first publication was 1556. See Townshend’s Preface, p. 288. In 1571 it was ordered in a convocation of the Anglican Church that a copy of Foxe’s Martyrology should be placed in all the churches in England.

² In Mr. Newman’s 8th Lecture on Romanism, the subject of which is the *Indefectibility of the Church Catholic*, I find this promise applied not to *Christ*, but to *the Church*;—the Church, according to Mr. N.’s definition of it. At p. 229, after remarking; “We make *the Church* the keeper and interpreter of Scripture; and Scripture itself conveys to the Church the charter of her office to be so,” he quotes in proof this passage; “As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord: my Spirit that is upon thee,” &c. And again p. 394; “God’s spirit which is upon *her*, [sc. the *Church*,] and his words which He has put in *her* mouth, shall not depart out of *her* mouth, nor out of the mouth of *her* seed’s seed, from henceforth and for ever.”

It is to be observed that *Zion* is mentioned in the verse preceding; “The Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob:” which *Zion*, in the assumed sense of “*the Church*,” Mr. N. makes use of, to bring out his interpretation of the verse under consideration. But the Hebrew rejects Mr. Newman’s version. *Zion* in verse 20 is in the Hebrew *feminine*. But the pronoun *thee* in verse 21 is *masculine*, עֲלֵיךָ. And so too, *thy* mouth, בְּפִיךָ; viz. the Redeemer’s.—The mistake is, I presume, an oversight. But it is one deeply to be regretted: for it is not unlike in its antichristian character to that of the Romanists, who construe the promise, “*It shall bruise thy head*,” said of *Christ*, the *seed* thus, “*She shall bruise it*;” viz. the Virgin Mary.

thy seed's seed, from henceforth even for ever."¹ To the same effect was the promise given by our Lord Jesus Himself, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" i. e. against his *true* church: and again, just before his ascension, and in connection with the charge given to his apostles and their successors in the Christian ministry of going and discipling all nations, his declaration, "Lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world."²

—Could it be then that the *forty-two months*, or forty-two times thirty days, i. e. 1260 *prophetic days* or *years*, of the apostacy, should have prolonged their dreary course without a witness having been kept up for Christ? It was in the *nature of the case* impossible. It would have been the falsification of these direct promises, as well as the abandonment, I may say, of his own glory.

—Thus we see, independently of any fresh prediction of it, the fact was one of which the beloved disciple must have felt well assured. In the Apocalyptic visions, however, as nothing of importance was to be omitted, so a fresh and full communication was now made to him on the subject. After mention of the forty-two months, during which the heathenized Christians of the apostacy (the same that had just been cast out at his command, in the measuring of the temple) would, as the Angel said, tread down the Holy City, or the faithful in Christendom, he proceeds to inform St. John that through a period precisely equivalent to those forty-two months there should be all along witnesses to testify for Him: "I will give power to my two witnesses; and they shall prophesy 1260 days clothed in sackcloth."

Now with regard to this great prediction about the Witnesses, it seems to me that it may be treated with advantage under three principal *divisions*.—1st, there is the *commission, character, and previous earlier history* of the Witnesses, as retrospectively described by the Angel, and as fulfilled; 2ndly, the *particular and later*

¹ Chap. lix. 21.—Compare Hag. ii. 5; "According to the word which I covenanted with you when I came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you. Fear ye not!"

² Matt. xxviii. 20.

history, as described and fulfilled, of their *slaughter* and *resurrection*; 3rdly, the notice of the *ascent* of the Witnesses, and certain important *political* events cotemporaneous with it. Which last division I purpose to treat of separately from the second, and by itself, for this reason, viz. because it seems broken off from what precedes by a notable change in the *person narrating*; what precedes being related retrospectively by the Angel, then the narration at length resumed by St. John.¹ Thus the events described previous to the break must be regarded as *already past* at the epoch correspondent with the Angel's giving the narration; that is, at the epoch next following that of the ecclesiastical constitution of the Reformed Churches and the Diet of Augsburg; on the other hand, those described after the break as chronologically *subsequent* to that epoch, and as marking the yet further development and progress of the Reformation.

This premised, I proceed to the *first* and largest of these divisions; being that which is to be the subject of the present Chapter, and which answers to the Apocalyptic extract heading it. And, with a view to distinctness, I shall in the first place and the first Section consider the general description of the Witnesses given in the *prophecy*; then in the three or four subsequent Sections their realization in *history*.

§ 1.—THE WITNESSES AS DESCRIBED IN PROPHECY.

In the Angel's description of the two Witnesses, the following points are observable.

1st. The term designating them implies *personality*. For in the only nine other places where the word *μαρτυς*, *witness*, is used in the New Testament, there can be no question that *persons* are intended by it; and so too in

¹ The change is marked by St. John's resuming the narration, after the Angel's interlocution, in his own person in verse 12; *ἤκουσα*, "I heard a great voice from heaven," &c. That this is the true reading will be shown, on I believe conclusive evidence, when we come to the discussion of that passage.

the forty or fifty passages where it occurs in the Old Testament, as derived from the Hebrew word properly corresponding.¹—The same inference results from what is said of their *prophesying*; for the verb *prophesy*, which may be found some hundred times in the Bible, is never used but of *persons*: besides that *persons* witnessing for Christ are elsewhere in the Apococalypse distinctly noted.²—I make this observation because not a few modern expositors, following certain others more ancient, have supposed the two Witnesses to mean things inanimate,—the Old and New Testaments.³ There cannot be a reasonable doubt, I conceive, that *living confessors* were intended.

2. The appellative “*my Witnesses*,” points out to us the grand subject of their witnessing, viz. the *Lord Jesus*; his glory, his grace, his salvation. A point this the rather to be observed respecting them, because of their having been represented by some Expositors as witnesses *simply* and *distinctively* against the *Papacy*; thus furnishing a handle to objectors:⁴ whereas, being simply described as Witnesses *for* JESUS, they need not be supposed to have assumed prominently the aggressive character of direct remonstrants against the Apostacy, whether in the *East* or in the *West*, except in proportion as that system should have authoritatively incorporated and enforced its growing superstitions and impieties, in open and necessary hostility to the doctrine of Jesus.—Let me add from another predictive passage, Apoc. xii. 17, where the same individuals are doubtless spoken of,

¹ The only exception, I believe, is in Gen. xxxi. 52, *μαρτυς ἡ στήλη αὐτῆς* “This pillar is a witness.” But here the Hebrew original is not *מָרְטָא* in the masculine, but *מָרְטָא* in the feminine.

² See Apoc. xii. 17; “The dragon went to make war with the remnant of her seed, that keep the commandments of God, and hold to the testimony on witnessing for Jesus:” *εχοντων την μαρτυριαν τῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* a passage cited under the next head.

³ So Galloway, Frere, Irving, &c. of the *moderns*; of the *ancients* Tichonius. Mr. Brooks, p. 449, speaks of Vitringa as interpreting the two Witnesses of the Old and New Testament, conjointly with living confessors. This is however hardly correct. He explains the *Witnesses* simply as *living confessors*, but the two *tubes* of the candlestick in Zechariah as the *Holy Scripture* and *preaching*. See Vitringa, pp. 622—626.

⁴ E. g. Maitland. See his Remarks, p. 95, and Facts and Doc. p. 80, &c.

that they are designated as those who “observed the commandments of God,” as well as who “kept up the testimony of Jesus.” These two characteristics always were, and in fact always will be, found united. They that testify for Jesus will be the persons most observant of God’s commandments: they that testify other than *his* doctrine will observe rather the commandments of *men*.

3. They are described as “the two *olive-trees* and the two *candlesticks*, or *lamp-sconces*, that stand before the Lord of the whole earth.”

Of these emblems the *candlesticks* or *lamp-sconces*, are explained by Christ Himself to symbolize *Christian Churches*:¹ i. e. communities uniting together in a true Christian profession and worship; the individual members contained in which shone, by their consistent doctrine and life, as lights in the world.²—We must remember that these might be small, as well as large. We read in the 4th of the Colossians, verse 15, of the Church in the house of Nymphas. In the present case the whole description indicates paucity of number and depression.

As to the emblem of *olive-trees*, since it was the olive tree that supplied nourishment to the temple-lamps,—it being commanded that pure *oil-olive* should alone be burnt in them,³—it would seem that those must be symbolized thereby, who supplied the needful spiritual nourishment to the Christian churches; in other words all faithful *ministers* and *gospel-preachers* ministering to them. And to this effect indeed is the explanation given of the emblem in Zechariah.⁴ “I said, what be these.

¹ Apoc. i. 20.—Compare 1 Kings xi. 36; “that David my servant may have a light (or lamp) always before me in Jerusalem.”

² Phil. ii. 15, ὡς λυχνιοί the Church being the λυχνία. The distinction has not been always noted. Compare Numb. viii. 2, 3; Matt. v. 15.

³ Exod. xxvii. 20.

⁴ Zech. iv. 11, &c.—In Zechariah’s vision it may be that two olive-trees *growing in the Court of the Temple* appeared to stretch out branches through the Temple walls, and so to drop the oil of their olives into the bowl of the candlestick. For from David’s figure of himself, “I am like a green olive-tree in the house of my God,” (Psalm lii. 8) it seems not improbable that olive-trees may have been actually growing there. Or it may be that the reference of the prophetic imagery was to the *olive-tree door-posts* of the temple, of which we read 1 Kings vi. 33; and which may have appeared in Zechariah’s vision in their natural form and vitality, and so stretching thence to the golden candlestick.

two *olive-trees* upon the right side of the candlestick and the left? And I answered again, What be these two *olive-branches* which through the golden pipes empty the oil out of themselves? Then said He, These are the two anointed ones (Marg. the two sons of oil)¹ that stand by the Lord of the whole earth." Now under the Jewish dispensation, they that as individuals, in the special sense of the words, *stood before the Lord*, and who also were *anointed* for the purpose, were the *Priests* and the *Prophets*; ² those that under an ordinary or an extraordinary commission, (for the prophets, let it be well marked, were not always of the *sacerdotal* tribe and order,³) taught and ministered publicly, whether in the world, or in the congregation. Under the Christian dispensation the counterpart to the *former* of these are regularly ordained Christian Ministers; to the *latter*, Evangelists of a more extraordinary commission.

From the *union* of the two symbols, of *lamps* and *olive-trees*, we are to understand that both the *ministers* or *gospel-preachers*, and the *churches* or *communities* taught by them, were alike included in the Apocalyptic Witnesses.

¹ If this marginal translation be taken,—and from the nature of the emblem it seems to me preferable,—we must take it I think *actively*, as designating *communicators of oil*. So James and John are called *sons of thunder*, in Mark iii. 17, with reference to the power of the word *issuing from them*; Barnabas the *son of consolation*, Acts iv. 36, in the sense of a *consoler*, &c; musicians, the *sons of noise*, (Heb.) Jer. xlvi. 45; and a fruitful hill of olives, a horn *the son of oil*, (Hebr.) Isa. v. 1; i. e. as producing it.

² Of the *Priests and Levites* we read thus in Deut. x. 8; "The Lord separated the tribe of Levi to *stand before the Lord*, to minister unto Him, and to bless in his name:" and again Deut. xviii. 7, &c.—Of the *Prophets* it is made frequently a characteristic, as in the cases of *Elijah* and *Elisha*; "As the Lord liveth *before whom I stand*;" 1 Kings xvii. 1, xviii. 15, 2 Kings iii. 14, v. 16. Also of *Jeremiah* when fulfilling his prophetic office; Jer. xv. 19.—In the same sense I conceive that the *two anointed ones* of Zechariah's vision meant the two Prophets, *Haggai* and *Zechariah*, who ministered oil to the lamp of the Jewish Church, when burning dim and nearly extinct; not, as most Commentators interpret, *Zerubbabel* and *Joshua*. A civil Governor or Prince is no where said in Scripture, I believe, to stand before God.—Compare 1 Kings x. 8, 2 Kings v. 25.

I need hardly adduce examples to show that the phrase is used also of *churches* or *congregations collectively*, when met to worship before God.

³ *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*, and sundry other prophets were of the sacerdotal tribe and order: but *Elijah's* tribe is not told us; and both *David* and *Daniel* were of the tribe of Judah, *Amos* a herdsman of Tekoa, &c.—Again even *women* were sometimes commissioned prophetesses. So *Deborah* for example, and *Huldah*: the latter consulted by King *Josiah*, at the time when the temple and its priesthood were in full establishment. See 2 Kings xxii. 14.

4. We must observe the *number* noted, "my *two* Witnesses."—We may take for granted that here, as uniformly elsewhere in the Apocalypse, the *representative* system is followed; and thus that the *two* witnesses, instead of being *two individuals*, as some of the early Fathers fancied,¹ stand for *many*.²—But why the number *two*; *unity* being most usually adopted in cases of representation? To this question the answer of Mede seems sufficient, that two or three witnesses were required in the Mosaic law to constitute a conclusive testimony;³ and therefore that had but *one* witness been made the representative of a number sufficient, so as is evidently intended, for effectively testifying, the usual propriety of emblem observable in the Apocalypse would have been wanting.—But, besides this, many commentators have supposed that *two separate lines* of witnesses are intended.⁴ And certainly, if such were the case, the *duality* of these *representative* Witnesses (a duality noted of their emblems, the *olive-trees* and *candlesticks*, as well as of themselves) would be still more satisfactorily accounted for, and still more according to Apocalyptic analogies. It must however be remembered that this latter supposition is not *necessary*; Mede's explanation being of itself sufficient.

Let me add that the circumstance of the *two*, not the

¹ So Tertullian, Hippolytus, Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerom, &c. supposed that they would be *Enoch* and *Elijah*. "Morituri reseruantur," said Tertullian, (*De Animâ*, c. 50,) "ut Antichristum suo sanguine extinguant." Others expected *Elijah* and *John the Evangelist*. See Calmet on Antichrist; or Brooks's Elements of Prophetic Interpretation, p. 444. In this supposition they have been followed by some modern Interpreters of the Maitland School; those who also expect a *personal* Antichrist, and believe that by the 1260 days are meant simply *days*, not *years*, in this prophecy.—I have already observed, and beg now again to remind the reader of it, that the whole *year-day* question will be fully discussed when we come to the xiiiith Apocalyptic Chapter.

² Enough, I hope, has already appeared in this commentary to satisfy the reader of the *representative system* being pursued in the Apocalyptic symbols; as, for instance, in the *horses* and their *riders* of the four first seals, &c.—See too p. 110, Note 1 *suprà*. Had this point been properly considered by the Fathers, they would not have entertained such views about Antichrist.

³ Numb. xxxv. 30, Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15, John viii. 17.—It is observed by St. Austin, when referring to a case mooted in the 7th Council of Carthage, that both the Ecclesiastical and Civil Law, then in force, (just like the old Jewish law) forbade the condemning any man on the unsupported evidence of a single witness. Bingham, xvi. 3. 10.

⁴ Especially Mr. Faber.

three, of the Mosaic law, being the number chosen, seems to indicate that the witnesses would be only just enough for the purpose;—the very smallest number that might suffice to make out the testimony satisfactorily. The which fact seems also implied in the specification of but two *lamp-sconces*; whereas both in Zechariah's vision, just alluded to, and also in the vision at the commencement of the Apocalypse, the number of symbolic lamps exhibited were *seven*.

5. Their *condition*, during the time of their witnessing, is indicated by the garb said to be worn by them; "They shall prophesy 1260 days *clothed in sackcloth*." Sackcloth was among the Jews the almost universal sign of *mourning*; as in the cases, for example, of Daniel, Mordecai, and the Ninevites:¹ and it was worn doubtless on this account by the ancient *Jewish* Prophets; their condition being generally one of trial, and often of persecution, amidst the prevailing apostacy and rebellion of their countrymen.² I infer the same respecting the condition of the Apocalyptic sackcloth-robed Witnesses. We must suppose that both their righteous souls would be vexed by the prevalent apostacy and irreligion of those around them, the Paganized Christians of the outer court: and also that they would often suffer persecution from those enemies of Christ and Christ's truth; politically supreme as they were to be during the 1260 days of the Witnesses prophesying.

6. The next thing noted of the two Witnesses, is the *avenging power* given them against their enemies. "Who-soever will injure them, fire goeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies:—these have power to shut heaven, that it rain not during the days of their prophecy;—and have power over the waters to turn them

¹ Dan. ix. 3, Esther iv. 1, 2.

² See the references in Cruden on the word Sackcloth; especially Isa. xx. 2.—In Zech. xiii. 4, *false prophets* are spoken of as also wearing a rough dress, or of sackcloth; and so too those alluded to by our Lord in Matt. vii. 15, "Which come to you in sheep's clothing:" but in these cases the rough dress was worn hypocritically, and to help them in their feigning of the prophetic character.—Compare Heb. xi. 37; "They wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented."

to blood,—and to smite the earth with every plague, as often as they will.” There is a reference evidently in all this to the supernatural power, that attached to certain of the ancient prophets, of *literally* thus acting against their enemies : viz. to *Moses and Aaron*, who turned the Nile-waters into blood, on Pharaoh’s insulting and injuring them ; and to *Elijah*, who both commanded fire from heaven to slay the enemies that would have taken him, and invoked a drought of three and a half years on apostate Israel.—In the present case the figurative character of the whole prophecy shows that these statements (like others of the same class) are meant *figuratively* ; and so too as they might apply to the two Apocalyptic Witnesses, the symbolic representatives of a long succession of many. It could not be that for 1260 years there should be no *natural* rain :—a *spiritual* drought must be intended. Again, their *turning the waters into blood* can only be interpreted of the bloodshed of wars, inflicted in God’s Providence on the enemies of the Witnesses ; and the *fire going out of their mouths*, of God’s fiery judgments destroying the apostates *nationally* that might have persecuted them.—So in fact the phrases are interpreted elsewhere in prophecy. In a former part of the Apocalypse the *sea becoming blood* was shewn to symbolize *bloody maritime war*.¹ On Jeremiah’s testimony being rejected, and himself persecuted by the Jews, God’s predictive declaration, “ I will make my words in thy mouth fire, and this people wood, and it shall devour them,”² was fulfilled, we know, by the subsequent burning of their *city*, and their destruction not *individually*, but as a *nation*. Again, as regards the *drought* spoken of, we read in Isaiah the threatening of the same judgment on the Jews, in the sense of the withholding from them of the dews of the Spirit ; “ I will command the clouds, that they rain no rain upon it.”³ And so too in that most striking passage in Amos ;⁴ “ The days come, saith the Lord, that I will send a famine on the land : not a famine

¹ See Vol. I. p. 350, &c. on Apoc. viii. 8. Compare also Apoc. xvi. 4.

² Jer. v. 14.

³ Isa. v. 6.

⁴ Amos viii. 11.

of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord. And they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the North even to the East : they shall run to and fro, to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it.”¹—Such seems the sense in which the figures are to be taken here also. To borrow Lowth’s language ; “ The prophet’s words would be like a judicial sentence against them ; with execution almost immediately ” (I would rather say, sooner or later) “ following.”

For, let me further observe, *immediate* fulfilment was not implied, in respect of the *destruction* spoken of as caused by *the fire* issuing from *the Apocalyptic Witnesses’ mouths*, any more than by the fire issuing from Jeremiah’s. The *individual* Witnesses or Prophets might even die ; and yet their words remain like fire to consume the guilty people. So it was said by Zechariah to the Jews, after their return from the captivity of Babylon : “ The prophets, do they live for ever ? Yet my words, which I commanded my servants the Prophets, did they not take hold of your fathers ? ”²—Of the judgments noted as to follow on the rejection and persecution of Christ’s Witnesses, *one* is declared to be *continuous*, through the whole period of their prophesying, viz. the spiritual drought, or shutting up of the dews of heaven ;—one *occasional*, the smiting the land with plagues as often as they will ;—the third we may infer to be *final* ; I mean the destruction of their enemies by fiery judgments from God.

7th, and lastly, with regard to the *commencing time* of the two Witnesses *testifying* in sackcloth, it is evidently (as already hinted) coincident with that of the heathenized christians treading the Holy City. And to fix in history this latter epoch there seems required the concurrence of two things : first the lapse of professing Christendom and its ruling powers into heathen idolatry ; secondly,

¹ Compare Gen. xli. 13 : “ As he interpreted to us, so it was ; me he (Joseph) restored to mine office, and him he hanged.” Isa. vi. 10 ; “ Make the heart of this people fat,” &c. Ezek. xliii. 3 ; “ When I came to destroy this city ; ” where the margin reads, “ When I came to prophesy that the city should be destroyed.” Also Jer. i. 10, &c.

² Zech. i. 6.

their oppression of the truth by antichristian laws.—In what was said *afterwards* to St. John of the same 1260 days period, its date of commencement was further defined as following after the Dragon's casting water out of his mouth to drown the woman, the Church; and marked by the woman's hiding in the wilderness, and the seven-headed wild Beast, that had power given it for the same forty-two months, rising from the sea; the instrument of Satan for making war against them that kept God's commands and the testimony of Jesus.¹—From these data to infer the *actual* commencing epoch will not be difficult; on proceeding, as we shall now do, to apply the various figures of which we have been speaking to the facts of real history.

§ 2.—THE EARLIER WESTERN WITNESSES TRACED IN HISTORY.

And now the duty devolves on me of tracing an actual succession of living witnesses for Christ, in character and history corresponding with the above descriptive sketch by the Apocalyptic Angel, throughout the dark fated period of the 1260 years. The Witnesses, we have seen, were to comprehend both *Preachers* of gospel-truth, and *Congregations* or *Churches* ministered to by them; like to the two olive-trees and two candlesticks of the symbolization in vision:—their witnessing to be for *Christ*, in contradistinction to, and against, the various antichristian superstitions of the apostacy, successively developed; and for the *rule of God's word* against the traditions and commandments of men:—their *condition*, finally, to be that of *mourning and persecution*, as of those that had to prophesy in *sackcloth*.—As to the *commencement* of the 1260 years of their thus prophesying,—it being the same apparently, as before said, with that of the *rise of the Beast from the sea*, described in chapter xiii, in other words, as will afterwards appear, of the Papal Anti-

¹ Apoc. xii. 15, 17; xiii. 5.

christ, and decem-regal Papal empire in Western Europe,¹ —we cannot well fix it much earlier, or later, than the beginning or the end of the 6th century. For it was not till about the former date that the Popes assumed the direct character of Antichrist; or till the latter that the Lombards in Italy, and the Saxon Heptarchy, just previously formed in Britain, united themselves as constituents to the Papal ecclesiastical government.² About which time that other characteristic of the 42 months, or 1260 days, noted in this xith chapter of the Apocalypse,—I mean that of *Gentiles of the outer court treading down the Holy City*, in other words of heathenized and idolatrous pseudo-christians occupying and bearing rule in Christendom, —had begun to have its fulfilment notoriously also. Already in former parts of my work I have traced the earlier progress of the Apostacy.³ In the 6th century this had become dominant. “The use and even worship of images,” says Gibbon, “was firmly established before the end of the 6th century :” and again ; “The Christians of the 7th century had insensibly relapsed into a semblance of Paganism : the throne of the Almighty was darkened by a cloud of martyrs, saints, and angels, the objects of popular veneration.”⁴ And so too Mosheim : “At this time, (i. e. in the 7th century,) true religion, weighed down by a heap of insane superstitions, was unable to raise its head. The earlier christians were wont to worship God and his Son only. But in this age they who were called Christians worshipped the wooden cross, the images of saints, and bones of men they knew not whom.”⁵—The dedication at Rome of the *Pantheon*, previously Temple of all the *Pagan Gods*, to the *Virgin Mary and all the Saints*, A. D. 604, was a sign very notable of this substitution of a new form of heathen

¹ See Part iv, Chap. iv, *infra*.

² See *ibid*.

³ See especially my Part ii. Chap. i, and Chap. iii, at pp. 302, 374, &c, in my first Volume.

⁴ ix. 116, 261.

⁵ vii. 2. 3. 1.—The veneration of saints' *bones* and *relics* was throughout the sixth century chiefly characteristic of religious worship in *Western* Christendom; that of *images* of the worship in *Eastern* Christendom. See Dupin's Sketch of the Rise and Establishment of Image-Worship, appended to his Notice of the 2nd Council of Nice.

worship, albeit under Christian name, for the old. To which let me add, that the Theodosian or Justinian Code had already somewhat earlier been received in Western as well as Eastern Christendom, at least on ecclesiastical matters; by the laws of which Code the Pope's universal supremacy was recognized, and *heresy*, or deviation from the established doctrine and worship, made punishable with the severest penalties,¹ and even with death.

From about this epoch, then, we have to make our start in quest of witnesses for Christ. And these I shall hope to trace hereafter in *Eastern* as well as in *Western Christendom*: for in this double line I believe, in common with Mr. Faber and others, that a succession is traceable, although imperfectly indeed and interruptedly.—The subject is one on which, especially as considering its large extent, I would fain have contented myself by reference to other writers, chiefly Bishop Newton and Faber.² But its importance, in order to the completeness of my historical exposition of the Apocalypse, the difficulties of evidence involved in some parts of it that require careful sifting, and the strongly opposed sentiments to my own respecting it expressed by authors of repute, more especially by the famous Bossuet in the xviiith century, and Messrs. Maitland and Dowling quite recently, seem to render it almost imperative on me not to shrink from the discussion.—I purpose considering first the *earlier Western* Witnesses, the *West* being our chief and more permanent scene of interest; then the *earlier Eastern*; then the *two lines* at a later period, *after their comingling in Western Christendom*: each in a separate Section:—and with yet an additional Section appended in either case, in order to vindicate their Christian character, and right to the title we give them of Christ's Witnesses.

And *first*, and in the *present* Section, our subject is the *earlier* notices that are discernible in history of a

¹ See Petrus Siculus' allusion to the law, p. 234 *infra*.

² The latter, in his valuable Work on the Waldenses and Albigenes.

line of WESTERN WITNESSES for Christ, from about the beginning of the seventh century.—Respecting which, however, let me at once state that I only profess to offer them as *links* in a chain, not as a *continuous chain* itself. Yet they are such links, I think, as, connected with other evidence, may fairly warrant belief in the chain ; and its imperfection and brokenness accounted for in part by the predicted fact of the Witnesses being but *two*, the smallest number constituting a testimony, in part by the darkness of the age, and fact of much of the evidence respecting it having perished, and what remains having past through the hands of enemies.

Before entering here however on my more proper chronological period of inquiry, let me advert for a moment to those two remarkable individuals, previously raised up by God's special providence just at the disruption, as we saw long since, of the old Roman Empire under the Gothic tempest-blasts,—who were destined to exercise one at least, if not both, a most powerful influence on the subsequent witnessing for Christ in Western Christendom ;—I mean AUGUSTINE and VIGILANTIUS.—The *former*, eminent as a christian teacher in every point of view, was eminent most of all for his strenuous, holy, and for a time successful advocacy of the grand gospel-principle, that it is to *God's free grace in Christ Jesus*, preventing, forgiving, converting, sustaining, that man is indebted, *from first to last, simply and alone*, for salvation ; and this only in the way of *a living personal union of each individual soul with Christ*, by faith :—a doctrine which, in God's wisdom, his own previous history and experience (just like that of Luther afterwards) singularly qualified him to appreciate ;¹ and which was essentially opposed to the whole system of *will-worship, penance, and works of merit*, whether of *congruity or condignity*,² set forth in a spirit more and more Pelagian,

¹ See my Vol. I, Part i, Chap. vii, § 2 ; or Milner's account of Augustine. The subject well suited Milner's pious mind ; and he has done it justice.

² “ The Pelagians, says Milner, speaking of Vitalis, and the semi-Pelagians of the fifth century, “ having lost their first ground, now maintained that grace was

albeit under ecclesiastical forms, and with a professed condemnation of Pelagianism, by the great Apostacy.¹—The *latter* was eminent, as I have also in a former chapter observed,² in the character of an uncompromising protester, far-sighted quite beyond his age, against the then already commencing abuses and errors of relic and saint-worship, monasticism, celibacy, pilgrimages, and other such superstitious doctrines and practices.—After the failure of God's tremendous Gothic scourge to induce repentance and reformation in Roman Christendom, and its subsequent fuller adoption, ever more and more, of all the above-mentioned anti-christian errors and superstitions, it needed that the character of both these men of God should very soon be combined in the Witnesses for Jesus. For Augustine's weak point had been,—in part from a want of discernment in regard to the deadly tendency of some of the instealing superstitions, in part from love of peace, and deference to what was called the Church,—though protesting indeed, yet not to protest with sufficient discernment or decision against them.³ And when they were authoritatively enjoined in the system, it was then needed evidently in the Lord's *Witnesses*, not merely to meditate and feed on gospel-truth like Augustine's *in private*, so as did multitudes doubtless in their convents and their families, who were Christ's secret ones,⁴—nor merely to *protest for* the

given *according to that merit of men* which they shewed in attending to the word and prayer." Cent. v. ch. 3, ad fin.—Compare with this the doctrine of merit of *congruity* before justification in baptism, as well as of *condignity* afterwards, asserted in the discussions of the *Council of Trent* on Justification. "Sic quidem præfatur," says Calvin, of its celebrated Canon on Justification, "ut initio nihil spirent nisi Christum. Sed quum ad rem ventum est, multum abest quin illi relinquunt quod suum est. Imo nihil tandem aliud continet eorum definitio quàm tritum illud scholarum dogma, *partim gratiâ Dei, partim operibus suis*, justificari homines; ut aliquanto se magis verecundos ostendant quàm fuerit *Pelagius*." Calvin Antidot. p. 269.

¹ "La doctrine Pelagienne, repoussée de l'Eglise par Augustin, quand elle s'était avancée en face, se representa bientôt de côté, comme *semi-Pelagianisme*.—Il fit attacher un grand prix à des œuvres extérieures, à des observances légales, à des actes de pénitence," &c. Merle d'Aubigné, Book i. c. 2. It is always a gratification to me to refer to this admirable work:—and here the rather as my own view of the *Pelagian* spirit of the Apostacy, as one of its most important features, was drawn up quite independently.

² See Vol. I. pp. 315, 316.

³ Vol. I. p. 314, Note 3.

⁴ See on Apoc. xii. 14.—Milner, v. 3, observes; "The effects of this effusion of

truth, so as did Augustine himself,—but also to protest *against* contrary prevailing *superstition and error*, even unto suffering, it might be, and death:—in short to unite in a measure, as was before said, the spirit and the doctrine of *Augustine* and *Vigilantius*.¹

Nor let me here omit to observe that the *locality* of *Southern France*, of which I shall have again to speak in a later Section, was even in those early times notable for association with these the true principles and doctrines of Christ's Witnesses. From Jerome's invective against him it appears that *Vigilantius'* chief sphere of protestation against the prevalent superstitions, and where both priests and bishops of the district joined him,² was that of the Gallic churches of *Languedoc*:³ and it seems very possible that his influence and doctrine may have extended eastward even to *Dauphiny* and the *Cottian Alps*, and beyond;—the *Cottian Alps* so famous afterwards as the seat of the *Waldenses*.⁴—Further, we know that *Augustinian* principles took early and deep root in the south of Gaul: and that *Augustinian* bishops, councils, and monasteries united to keep up there the remembrance of *Augustine's* doctrine.

the Spirit were operative many centuries afterwards, in the production of much real godliness in many individuals, particularly monastic persons; to whom for ages *Augustine's* writings were, next to the word of God, their greatest means of grace.—This observation is applicable both to *Christ's witnesses*, and *Christ's secret ones*: of the *Church in the Wilderness*, figured in Apoc. xii.

¹ *Vigilantius* is still in the Romish list of heretics.—Mosh. v. 2. 3. 14.

² "Proh nefas! Episcopos sui sceleris dicitur habere consortes:—si tamen episcopi nominandi sunt, qui non ordinent diaconos nisi prius uxores duxerint." Given in Gilly's *Vigilantius*, p. 391.

³ "Incurset Galliarum ecclesias, portetque nequaquam vexillum Christi sed insigne Diaboli." Ib. 394. Dr. Gilly infers his diocese to have been that of *Toulouse*.

As the range of his preaching may have reached as far as his birth-place, near the Pyrenees, of *Lugdunum Convenarum*, (a town afterwards generally called *Convenæ*, now *Cominges*), Mr. Faber suggests that *Vigilantius* may from this *Lugdunum* have been called a *Leonist*, and so traditionally *Leo*. But this surely is fanciful. Can Mr. F. adduce any example of *Vigilantius* ever bearing an appellation derived from this town of *Convenæ*? Any of an inhabitant of it being called *Leonista*? Any of *Leonista* being turned into *Leo*?

⁴ "Inter Hadriæ fluctus Cottique regis Alpes in nos declamando clamavit."—This was said of *Vigilantius'* speaking against *Jerom's* Origenism, and other errors, as the former viewed them, on his return from *Jerom* at *Jerusalem*; and before his more systematic protest.. (Gilly, 385). Still some seed of protest against prevailing error generally may then and there have been very probably sown by him.

In illustration of which last-mentioned fact, let me observe that about a century after him, we find *Cæsarius* illustrating his Bishopric of *Arles* in *Dauphiny* by strenuous and successful opposition to Faustus' insidious semi-Pelagianism ;¹ himself writing a book,² and stirring Rome against it :³ and further in the Council of *Orange* in the same province, held A. D. 529 under his presidency, uniting with twelve other bishops, still of *Dauphiny* and *Provence*, in laying down as the one object of the Council, most strongly, clearly, yet guardedly, and all on the ground of inspired scripture,⁴ Augustine's evangelic doctrines above stated, including that of personal spiritual union with Christ, as, like the vine to the branches, the soul's one source of life ;⁵ and urging them on both priests and laics, as the *healing* doctrine for man's soul.⁶

¹ Faustus' book is given in the B. P. M. Vol. viii.

² Baronius says it is lost.

³ Pope Hormisdas' condemnation of Faustus, thus procured, is given in Har-
duin ii. 1038. Compare my remarks on the Pope's approbation of Augustine's
doctrine, given Vol. i. p. 284.

⁴ In the above-mentioned Council of Orange, the condemnatory judgment
passed in the canons on the various Pelagian errors, is uniformly grounded on
Scripture—Scripture cited at large in each case, as the true rule of faith. "Si
quis, &c ; adversatur Scripturæ dicenti" or, "contradicit apostolo," &c :—all
agreeably, indeed, it was added, to the fathers ; but without any citation from
them

In the Council of *Vaison*, held the same year, A. D. 529, under *Cæsarius'* pre-
sidency, it was laid down, that in the education of young men by country priests
for the pastoral office, they should be taught "to learn the Psalms, read the
Scriptures, and acquaint themselves with the word of God."—It is further related
of *Cæsarius* that he urged the people not to be content with hearing the Scrip-
tures in the church, but to read them also at home. ; Milner vi. 2.—Of his Homi-
lies I have said something in a preceding Chapter. Those that are extant seem
to me to bear frequent marks of interpolation and altering by those who used
them in after ages. They are practical, but a little ascetic in character.

⁵ The twenty-five Canons of the Council are *all* on this subject of grace. Let
me give that about Christ the vine, as a specimen. "Ita sunt in vite palmites ut
viti nihil conferant, sed inde accipiant unde vivant : sic quippe vitis est in palmiti-
bus, ut vitale alimentum subministret eis, non sumat ab eis. Ac per hoc et
manentem in se habere Christum, et manere in Christo, discipulis prodest utrum-
que, non Christo. Nam, præciso palmite, potest de vivâ radice alius pullulare.
Qui autem præcisus est sine radice non potest vivere." Hard. ii. 1100.

Compare the saying of Avites, the cotemporary bishop of Vienne. "Ita liberum
arbitrium Augustinus docet, ut illuminatio, virtus, et salus illi à Christo, et
per Christum, et cum Christo sit." So Ado in his *Chronicon*, ad ann. 492.
B. P. M. xvi. 798.

⁶ "Non solum religiosi, sed etiam laici, *medicamentum* esse et desideramus
et cupimus." In attestation of the *laics'* interest in the doctrine, *Cæsarius* had
the subscriptions of *noblemen* (viri illustres,) as well as of Bishops, appended to
the Canons. A proceeding as rare, as it was significant of the man's earnestness
who directed it.

His life corresponded with the christian excellence, so exprest, of his doctrine. It was given to the unwearied self-denying fulfilment of his pastoral duties. But he was not exempt from trial and persecution. He was once calumniated to the mob as a traitor, and imprisoned ; at another to King Alaric, and by him expelled a while from his bishoprick ; though soon in either case his innocence was acknowledged.¹ He spoke of the world, like Augustine, as a wilderness ; and thirsted for a draught from the water of life.²

Nor let me omit to note the similar cotemporary witness held by *Fulgentius*, and many other African bishops and ministers, on occasion of the ferocious Arian persecutions of the Vandal Hunneric. For it was not merely for the divinity of the Lord Jesus that they witnessed and suffered, but for the Augustinian doctrines of grace. On that grand point of divine truth, *the entireness of the work of divine grace in man's salvation*, they wrote a synodic letter from their exile in Sardinia, to some of their brethren on the African continent, in part with joy, in part sorrow : joy because those they wrote to held the true view of God's grace in Christ ; sorrow because *others*, as they heard, exalted against it the freedom and power of man's own will. And, guarding against the *ecclesiastical* semi-Pelagianism which was instealing, as well as against direct Pelagianism, they urge that as Esau was *circumcised*, yet perished, because he loved darkness rather than light, so would every *baptized* person *within* the Church, just as others *without* it : the highest ecclesiastic being no more included on that account in God's vessels of mercy than the lowest of the seculars. They conclude with urging the study of Augustine, and asserting his doctrine that God gave to his elect both grace and perseverance : so that it might be all in the way of grace for grace that they should receive

¹ On occasion the one of the war between the Gothic King Alaric, and the united Franks and Burgundians ; the other of the siege of Arles by the latter powers. See Baronius.

² " Si quid habet homo veritatis atque justitiæ, ab illo fonte est quem debemus sitire in eremo." This is the 22nd canon of the Council.

the gift of eternal life.¹—Others² later in the century maintained the same doctrine. On them I need not dwell. But let me not omit to observe that these men applied not the doctrines of gospel-grace to themselves or others with the clearness or consistency that we might. *Alike* Fulgentius and Cæsarius erred on the side of asceticism. They saw not whither it was leading. Nor, again, had they a perception of the part Rome was about to take in the apostacy. Thus, though in either case a notable public testimony for the essential doctrines of Christ, yet it was as that of *Jansenist* confessors,³ if I may anticipatively use the phrase, rather than *Protestant*.

I now pass to that period at which our inquiries were more properly to begin,—*the opening of the seventh century*:—then when Paganized Christians, as before said, trod in authority the mystic temple; and when the lights of the sacred candlestick, gradually reduced from their sevenfold completeness, had dwindled into the smallest number that God's purposes and the perpetuation of his gospel-truth might permit.⁴ And here, at the outset, just when *Gregory the Great*, Bishop of Rome, had become eminent,—that most effective preparer for the Pope's assumption of headship of the apostacy,—we find SERENUS, Bishop of Marseilles, in a district adjoining that which had been visited and taught long before by Vigilantius, witnessing in somewhat of the same spirit as that great reformer, against a sin and error, which, by calling the then pseudo-christians *Pagans*, the Holy Spirit seems to hold up for our particular notice, as throughout the 1260 years one most prominent characteristic of the consummated apostacy;—

¹ See this most interesting Letter in Harduin, Concil. ii. 1055. The date A. D. 521. See too Milner's account of Fulgentius.

² E. g. *Primasius*.
³ Cæsarius and his favourite monastery of Arles, the latter ruled over by his sister Cæsaria as Abbess, sympathized in spirit, if I mistake not, with that of the Port Royal des Champs, its Arnaud, and its Abbess, Marie Angélique, though across eleven centuries intervening.

⁴ Mr. Scott observes, on Exod. xxv. 32, that the seven candlesticks might any one be taken off or fixed on the chandelier of the Temple. The observation illustrates also Apoc. ii. 5; "I will move thy candlestick out of its place."

I mean the sin of *image-worship*. Against this, Serenus protested, not in word alone, but deed. He ordered the *destruction* of the images of saints that had now commonly been set up and were worshipped in the churches of his diocese. The popular opposition, and appeal to Rome made against him, shows the strength of the idolatrous feeling then and there prevalent. And alike this, and Pope Gregory's reasonings and remonstrances, must needs have made his course onerous and painful. But it was in vain. Serenus persisted in his purpose; as one that would destroy Baal out of the land.

And thus the error of *image-worship* begins now to force itself on the attention of an inquirer, whether his subject be the advance of the antichristian Apostacy, or the acting out of a witnessing for Christ in the midst of it; and will necessarily continue to do so, as he progresses through the ecclesiastical history of Roman Christendom, Eastern and Western, up to the epoch of the two great Councils of Nice and Frankfort, summoned to treat of it towards the close of the 8th century.—Wherefore, it may here be thought, this earnest suggestion and promotion of image-worship by him, the Spirit of evil, who was from the first the real though unseen author and promoter of the Apostacy; and why not the worship of visible *relics*, as well as of invisible *saints*, that had already long been established among the people, acquiesced in by him as sufficient for his purpose? In answer to which question, judging from the facts of after history, and the nature both of man and Satan, may not the following be suggested as probable reasons:—viz. with regard to the *people*, that images, by presenting definite human forms to the eye, served better than relics to satisfy the worshippers' imagination, to prevent it from wandering into thoughts of the disembodied and the spiritual, and to chain it down to earth;—with regard to the *priesthood*, that images offered greater facilities for playing off juggleries on credulous devotees, such as were played off by Pagan priests before;¹—and with re-

¹ See p. 15 *suprà*.

gard to *Satan* that their worship constituted a more direct and literal transgression of God's commands than that of relics, while, at the same time, being applicable to Christ Himself, as well as to departed saints, they thus presented the most admirable means, through pictures of the Virgin and Child, of pouring contempt on the divine Saviour, and impressing views of Him as but subsidiary to her his Mother in the Hierarchy of Heaven?—Such seems to me its explanation. But, however this might be, it was in *Eastern* Christendom that during the seventh century this form of idolatry became first, on the scale of the whole nation, a popular passion: and there consequently, as will appear in my next Section, there was first raised up on a great scale a witnessing for Christ against it. But meanwhile in the *West* too, though its Bishops and other ecclesiastical dignitaries answered not to Eastern zeal for image-worship, yet the Popes of Rome at their head, gave it from first to last their warm sympathy. Even Gregory I, we saw, remonstrated against Serenus' removal of images from his churches, though he declared himself against their *worship*; and it was evidently with his approbation that Augustine, his chosen missionary to Britain, introduced his mission there with an imaged crucifix.¹ Then, a century and more later, Pope Gregory II anathematized and raised Italy in rebellion against the Greek Emperor Leo, on occasion and account of his interdicting image-worship:² and, finally, Pope Adrian took prominent part with the Greek Empress, his cotemporary, in convening and inducing the great Council of Nice, A. D. 787, to establish it. Which being the case, *some* witnessing in the West, as the thing advanced, might be expected against it. Nor, though doubtless scanty, (a scantiness in part accounted for by the literary obscurity of the period³) is evidence of this

¹ "They came bearing a silver cross for a banner, and the *image* of our Lord and Saviour painted on a board." Bede.

² See Mosheim viii. 2. 3. 11.—It is said by some (as Bower) that he (Gregory II) at the same time summoned a Roman Council, A. D. 730, which added the authority of a Council to that of the Pope personally, in favour of image-worship.

³ Thus Masson, speaking of Viventolus, an *eminent* Archbishop of Lyons in the earlier part of the 8th Century, is forced to say "Quæ eùm perierint," (i. e.

totally wanting. As *Serenus* in Southern France, so the ancient *Anglo-Saxon Church* not long after protested with prolonged protest against it in Britain.¹ And after an interval,—a long interval, but narrowed by the consideration that *Serenus'* example and opinions must almost necessarily in the nature of things have had disciples and converts to perpetuate it,²—there seems to have been an action on the mind of *Western Christendom* from the mind of Witnesses for the truth in *Eastern Christendom*. Passing an obscure notice of certain heretics driven from parts beyond the seas, whom in 650 the Bishops in the neighbourhood of Orleans found hard to convict of heresy, yet at length convicted, we are not told why, and expelled,³—a case of which subsequent

his writings) “aut adhuc alicubi lateant, de successoribus dicendum est.” B. P. M. xiv. 237 : and again ; “obscura temporum nebulis.” ib.

In regard of the localities to which our attention is specially directed of *Dauphiny* and *Piedmont*, this may be partially accounted for by the unsettledness of their political state. Through the 7th century *Viennese Gaul* appears to have been under the doubtful government, or misgovernment, of the Dukes of Burgundy and Aquitaine, and the Frank Mayors of the Palace. Besides which, through the first half of the 8th century, it was wasted under repeated invasions of the Saracens ; who about the year 740 besieged and took Aix in Provence, (see P. Warnefrid's History of the Lombards,) nor were finally driven out for some ten years afterwards. In *Lombardy*, through the same 150 years,—i. e. until the time of Pepin's and Charlemagne's intervention to aid the Roman See against them,—we read of the perpetual insurrection and conflict against each other of the various local Lombard chieftains (specially the *Dukes of Turin*) striving for the supremacy.

¹ “An old Welsh Chronicle preserved at Cambridge says ; ‘After that by means of Austin the Saxons became Christians, in such sort as Austin had taught them, the Britons would not either eat or drink with or salute them ; because they corrupted with *superstition, images, and idolatry* the true religion of Christ.’” Cited in Hearn's *Man of Sin*, p. 21.

² For example, it is said that the influence of the ministrations of *Baxter* were perceptible *locally* in Kidderminster 100 years after his death.—So too in the case of *Mr. Venn* at Huddersfield. See the Introduction to his lately published Memoir.—How much longer and more evident the perpetuation of ministerial influence, when consideration is taken of it unrestrictedly as to locality, and as extended by writings as well as ministrations ! Nourished with the oil received from it, the candlestick would continue to shine for no little time after any particular olive-branch ceased its dropping.

³ “Per idem ferè tempus (A. D. 650) quidam hæreticus pulsus à partibus transmarinis in Gallias venit ; moxque se conlerens ad civitatem quæ olim Hedua nunc autem Augustodunum vocatur, cœpit tam cautè quàm fraudulenter sua nefanda dogmata prodere. Quod cùm in palatio ad aures Eligii Noviomensis Episcopi pervenisset, cœpit vigilanter cùm Audoeno et cæteris catholicis viris tractare quemodmodum hanc pestem palam omnibus manifestam denegarent ; nec destitit Episcopos commonere et optimates, quo usque jussu Principis sacerdotale concilium apud urbem Aurelianensem congregaretur. Ubi, eo quem dixerim hæretico in medium deducto, conabantur cum docti quique diversis modis interpellare ;

similar records¹ cannot but make us long to know more,—it appears that there was gathered a century after another Council at Chantilly, near Paris, expressly to discuss the question of image-worship: it being caused according to Romanist Conciliasts by the fact of an embassy from the then Greek *iconoclast* Emperor having there and then sown the seeds of the iconoclastic impiety, in direct opposition to the Popes.² And this was but preparatory to the great COUNCIL OF FRANKFORT, A. D. 794, under Charlemagne, and protest of 300 Bishops of Western Christendom, as well as its Emperor, in opposition to the Popes of Rome, against image-worship.³

sed nullo poterant genere concludere: tantâ quippe dicendi arte objectis quæstionibus occurrebat, ut ubi maximè putaretur constrictus teneri ibi ceu anguis lubricus quibusdam foraminibus dilapsus eorum se fronti opponeret. Cùmque nullo modo à quoquam posset concludi aut superari, extitit quidam à nostris piâ Dei providentiâ doctissimus Episcopus, nomine Salvius, qui ita ei in omnibus obviavit, ut ingens eâ causâ nostris fieret gaudium et expectatio: omnes enim ejus versutias et artes, quas ille nunc occultere, nunc etiam dissimulare conabatur, frequenti disputatione palam funditus detexit: sicque adversus eum omnium Episcoporum sententia prolata, et per singulas civitates super ejus nomine decretis constitutis, cùm eâ quæ par erat ignominia et dedecore à finibus Galliæ eliminatus est.”—“Hæc Audoenus, says Baronius; “sed quinam hæreticus iste, vel cujus hæresis fuerit, ignoratur.”

¹ See the Sketch of anti-heretical Councils in my Section 4 infra.

² I borrow from Mr. Townshend's Preface to Foxe, p. 291—294. The following are parts of his citations from Bail and Ademar.

1. “Concilium Gentiliacense de cultu Sanctarum Imaginum, ac de Sanctissimâ Trinitate, celebratum in Galliâ anno 766, tempore Pauli Papæ.

Legatio illa, quam pro confederatione Pipini regis impetrandâ Constantinus Imperator miserat in Franciam, hæc impietatis zizania” (sc. opposition to image-worship) “seminaverat: pro quibus extirpandis hisce sarculis opus erat. Nemo quidem scriptorum illud expressè affirmat; sed tamen, quia Francorum Annales evidenter commemorant per nobilissimam legationem aliquanto tempore actum fuisse de fœdere ineundo, haud dubiè hæc impietatis semina ibidem sparsa fuerunt.” Bail. Summa Concil. Tom. ii. pp. 290, 291. (Ed. 1701.)

2. “Ortâ questione de Sancta Trinitate et de Sanctorum Imaginibus inter Orientalem et Occidentalem ecclesiam, Rex Pipinus, conventu in Gentiliaco villâ congregato, Synodum de ipsâ quæstione habuit; eoque peracto ad bellum prædictum conficiendum post Natalem Domini in Aquitaniam proficiscitur; et per Narbonem iter agens Tolosam aggressus cepit; Albiensem et Gavuldensem pagos in deditione accepit: et Viennam reversus,” &c.—Adelmar, Annales Francorum, p. 387. (Ed. 1613). Mr. Townshend suggests that the *Gavuldenses* here mentioned in conjunction with the *Albigenses*, may probably have been the people afterwards famous under the name *Waldenses*; and that possibly this first attack on them may have been in consequence of their taking the anti-image and anti-papal side of the question. But proof is wanting.

³ Canon 2. “Allata est in medium quæstio de novâ Græcorum synodo quam de adorandis imaginibus Constantinopolitani fecerunt: in quâ scriptum habebatur ut qui imaginibus sanctorum, ita ut Deificæ Trinitati, servitium aut adorationem non impenderent, anathema judicarentur. Qui suprâ sanctissimi Patres nostri, omnimodis adorationem et servitum renuentes, contempserunt atque consentientes condemnaverunt.” Hard. iv. 904.

It was certainly a most remarkable protest of Western Christendom against that heathenish practice of antichristian superstition.—Nor was this all. For by its reception of *Alcuin* into the Council, and eulogium in its last canon on his erudition in ecclesiastical doctrine,¹ it adopted and identified itself generally with *Alcuin's* published opinions on religion. What these were appears both from other of his writings, and also from the Capitularies of Charlemagne drawn up by *Alcuin* :² in the which there was set forth, says Bishop Newton, “ doctrine respecting the sufficiency of the Scriptures, the worship of God alone, prayers in the vulgar tongue, the eucharist, justification and repentance, pretended visions and miracles, and other like points, such as a Papist would abhor, and a Protestant would subscribe.” He adds that in these Capitularies, and those of Louis the Pious, there was enjoined the reading of the canonical scriptures, as the sole rule of faith, without any regard to human traditions or Apocryphal writings, and the forbidding of private masses and other similar superstitions.—With these sentiments then we may consider the Bishops of Western Christendom, including those from Dauphiny and Piedmont,³ to have admitted their concurrence at the great Council of Frankfort.⁴ And indeed with respect to one of the number, *Paulinus* of *Aquileia*, specified above, we have the distinct record of

¹ Canon 56. “*Communuit Rex ut Alcuinum ipsa sancta synodus in suo consortio recipere dignaretur, eo quod esset vir in ecclesiasticis doctrinis eruditus. Omnis namque synodus consensit, et eum in eorum consortio receperunt.*”

² *Alcuin* was a native of England and the preceptor and friend of Charlemagne. The following beautiful extract has been quoted from his works as a specimen of his doctrine. “The reading of the Holy Scriptures is the knowledge of everlasting happiness. In the Holy Scripture man may contemplate himself as in a mirror. The reading of the Holy Scripture cleanseth the reader's soul, bringeth into his mind the fear of hell-punishment, and raiseth his heart to the joy above. The man who wishes to be ever with God should often pray to him, and often read the Holy Scriptures. He is happy who readeth them, if he turn the words into works. All the Holy Scriptures are written for our health ; that we may through them understand the truth.”

³ In the 8th Canon a dispute between the Bishops of *Vienne* and *Arles*, as to the suffragan sees, was determined. On others respecting the Bishoprics of *Embrun*, *Aix*, and *Tarentasia*, a reference was ordered to Rome.

⁴ It seems too that *auricular confession* was not as yet practised in the Churches of Languedoc and the Alps. *Alcuin* notices the fact with regret. Waddington p. 354. He did not enter into the true and evil character of this practice.

his both acting and writing conformably:—he having in 787, before the Frankfort Council, not only protested, together with other Italian Bishops, against the idolatrous Decree of the Nicene Synod, but most strongly and clearly also accordantly with Augustine his great model, set forth the doctrine of *Christ* as the only *Expiator of sin*, *Christ* as the only *Intercessor*, in opposition to the growing superstitions in favour of martyrs' atoning merits and saints' intercession.¹—It is further to be observed that as the judgment pronounced on the religious dogmas in question, was given as no *newly formed* judgment on them, there was implied that the same was the doctrine held, by many at least, long before the Council.² Paulinus himself, for example, having been born about the year 726, must probably have done the work of an Evangelist from the middle of the 8th century. Thus that long interval, over the witnessing in which we stated that there hung obscurity, must be considered as yet further narrowed.—Let me just add that, as the idolatrous superstitions condemned by Paulinus and the Frankfort

¹ See Milner Cent. viii. Ch. 5. Thus on Christ's Mediation: "*Paul*," he says, "is not a *Mediator*: he is an ambassador for Christ. *John* intercedes not; but declares that *He* is the Mediator who is the propitiation for our sins." Again: "The Son of God Almighty, our Almighty Lord, because He redeemed us with the price of his blood, is the true Redeemer. He himself was not redeemed. He had never been captive. We have been redeemed because we were captives sold under sin, bound by the hand-writing that was against us: which He took away, nailing it to his cross, blotting it out by his blood, triumphing over it openly in himself; having finished a work which the blood of no other redeemer could do."—He speaks of the *eucharist* as a spiritual life or death in the eater, according as he has or has not *faith*; and he builds his faith alone on the Holy Scriptures.—So agreeable was his doctrine to *Augustine's* that he was in the dark ages confounded with him.

² Probably, had we memorials of them, such would appear to have been the doctrine and character of *Viventolus*, Bishop of Lyons some time earlier in the 8th Century, of whom Agobard speaks as testified to for excellence and sanctity both by the writings of others and his own: all which, however, says Masson, in words before cited, have perished or remain unknown. Possibly such too that of *Benedict*, Archbishop of Milan in the same century: who took part in defence of the liberty of one of the Churches of Lombardy, though unsuccessfully, against Rome; and the fame of whose sanctity, Paul Warnefrid of Aquileia tells us, filled Italy. (Hist. Lombard § 29.)—With regard to an earlier period Mosheim refers to a Treatise of Ildephonzo of Toledo, *De Cognitione Baptismi*, in proof that *transubstantiation* was not then received in the Latin Church, and that the *Holy Scriptures* were in the hands of the people, and appealed to (though with the *Fathers* also) as the rule of religious doctrine.—(Mosheim says that the Treatises in praises of the Virgin Mary, assigned to Ildephonzo by Baronius, are not his.)

Council were enjoined from Rome, and generally cherished both by priests and people, the witnessing could scarce have been carried on without trial. At least wherever Rome bore sway, there, as in the cases of Serenus of Marseilles, and of the iconoclastic Greek Emperor when destroying the sacred images in the Exarchate of Ravenna, the witnessing must have induced persecution; the witnesses prophesied in sackcloth.

The testimonies next occurring are those of AGOBARD, Archbishop of LYONS from A. D. 810 to 841, on the one side the Alps, and of CLAUDE of TURIN on the other. —Of the *former* the protestation against *image-worship*, drawn out most fully and clearly in an express Treatise on the subject, has been often noticed.¹ But this was but a small part of his evangelic Protestant doctrine. In the same Treatise he states his views on the *invocation of Saints*: the character of which appears in the very heading of the 3rd chapter, “There is no other mediator to be sought for but He that is the God-man;”² and which has been branded as heretical in the Roman Index Expurgatorius.³ In a Treatise “against Anti-christ and the merit of works,” he combats the idea of merit in them with as much zeal and force, says Leger, (i. 20) as Calvin himself. Of another, “On the truth of the Christian faith,” Masson’s account is, (and I can myself speak, after perusal, to its justice,) “It has CHRIST for its subject.”⁴ Both here and every where in his works we trace the disciple of Augustine.⁵ To his integrity

¹ After quoting the charge in Deut. iv. against idolatry, “Lest ye see the sun and moon and adore them,” &c. he adds; “In quibus verbis notandum est quia si opera manuum Dei non sunt adoranda et colenda, nec in honore Dei, quanto magis opera manuum hominum non sunt adoranda et colenda, nec in honore eorum quorum similitudines esse dicuntur.” B. P. Max. xiv. 286. Quoted by Leger i. 20, and by Gilly in his Life of Neff.

² Quodd inter Deum et homines nullus sit alius Mediator quærendus nisi ille qui Deus est et homo.” B. P. M. ib. 286.

³ Bp. Newton, in his Chapter on the Witnesses, after quoting the above Title of Agobard’s Chapter on Christ’s being the only Mediator, adds, “So that it is no wonder that this Book is condemned in the Index Expurgatorius of Rome.”

⁴ “Hæc Concio est lepidissima, varia, et divinis figuris circumlucida. Habet pro materiâ Christum.” B. P. M. xiv. 242.

⁵ “Cujus” (i. e. of the Treatises against Images) “hæc præcipua sunt capita à Divo Augustino, cæterisque Patribus &c.” So Masson ibid. 241:—where mark,

and general excellence of life there is abundant testimony.¹ It appears however that he was not without persecution in his course. He quotes himself those words of Scripture: "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution."²

Pass we now beyond the Alps to CLAUDE, Bishop of TURIN. Here indeed was a man on whom it becomes the enquirer after a Western line of Witnesses to pause. He has been called, by way of eminence, the "Protestant of the 9th century."³ I would rather associate him with another soon to be spoken of; ⁴ and while calling Claude the *Protestant of the West*, designate his cotemporary, the Paulikian *Sergius*, as the *Protestant of the East*.—For above 20 years Claude labored unweariedly in his diocese, and was called to his rest about A. D. 840. Against him, just as against others of similar character, the cry of heresy was raised, both during life and yet more after death. In particular he was charged with *Arianism*. So among others by Jonas, the cotemporary Bishop of Orleans, and, in later times, by Bossuet. It was said by Jonas that he had not only taught and preached as an Arian, "but even in death left the same error written in his wicked books." But his books remain, and evince the falsehood of the charge. Nor this alone; but also that he was a true, fearless, enlightened, and spiritual witness for Christ's truth and honour, and against the superstition and wickedness of the age.—

in passing, the title *Divus* given to Augustine as a *canonized Saint*. In all Agobard's Works the quotations from Augustine are most copious.

¹ I say *general*, because in his old age he took the wrong step of siding with Lotharius against king Louis.—Against a *copy of verses* printed as his by Masson, *ibid.* 328, I should also except,—the subject of which is the translation of certain relics of Martyrs to Lyons, and in which he invokes Cyprian's tutelage,—but that it seems to me plainly spurious.

² Agobard, let me observe, was a *chorepiscopus*. So Hugo Flaviniacensis, in his Chronicle, cited by Baluzius in his Preface to Agobard's Works, B. P. M. xiv. 236. "In loco Leidradi Agobardus substituitur, ejusdem ecclesiæ *Chorepiscopus*." He adds; "Quod quidam defendere volentes, dixerunt eum a tribus Episcopis in sede Lugdunensi, jubente Leidrado, fuisse ordinatum." But, says Ado (*ibid.*), the Canons forbid two Bishops, i. e. two full Bishops, in one city.—The probability therefore is rather that he was ordained, as *Chorepiscopi* usually were only by one Bishop, (see *suprà* p. 168,) and used by Leidrad as his coadjutor.

³ Waddington p. 268.

⁴ See my next Section.

Hear his own account of the origin of all the enmity and charges against him.

“You declare yourself to have been troubled,” writes he to the Abbot Theutmir, “because a rumour respecting me has past out of Italy through all the lands, to the very borders of Spain: as if I had been preaching up some new sect contrary to the catholic faith:—a matter which is utterly false. It is no marvel however that Satan’s members should say these things of me, since he proclaimed our very Head himself to be a seducer and a dæmoniac. I who hold the unity, and who preach the truth, am teaching *no new sect.*” (Let the reader mark well this emphatic and repeated assertion.) “On the contrary, sects and schisms, and superstitions and heresies, I have always, so far as in me lies, crushed and opposed; and through God’s help will never cease to crush and oppose. But certainly this trouble has come upon me only because when, sorely against my will, I undertook at the command of Louis the Pious the burden of a Bishopric, and when, contrary to the order of truth, I found all the churches at Turin stuffed full of vile and accursed images,” (the idolatrous system, it seems, had already rooted itself in *Italy* much deeper than beyond the Alps in *Gaul*,) “I alone began to destroy what all were sottishly worshipping. Therefore it was that all opened their mouths to revile me. And forsooth, had not the Lord helped me, they would have swallowed me up quick.”

It has been observed that various works of Claude still remain to us;¹ and that they exhibit his character,—just as the above extract would lead us to expect,—in the light of a faithful disciple and witness for Christ. It appears from them, and from the Treatises written

¹ The following have been specified:—Commentaries on Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus; Commentaries on St. Matthew, and all the Epistles; also certain Letters. Of these the Commentary on the Galatians, and certain of his Letters have been alone published: the former in different editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. In my own edition, the *B. P. Maxima*, it is given in the xivth Volume, p. 139; and is followed by the anti-Claudian Treatises of Jonas and Dungal. The manuscripts of the others are in the Libraries of different monasteries. See Labbe’s report, prefixed to Claude’s Treatise in the *B. P. M.*; also Leger, Faber, &c.

against him, that his protestation was not against one error and superstition only of the times, but all :—against worship of saints, relics, and the wooden cross, as well as of images ;¹ against pilgrimages,² and all the prevailing Judaic, or formal and ceremonial, system of religion ;³ against masses for the dead ;⁴ against what was afterwards called transubstantiation in the eucharist ;⁵ against the supremacy of the Pope of Rome ;⁶ and the authority of tradition in doctrines of religion.⁷—The written word was made by him the one standard of truth. He declared the essence of heresy to consist in a departure from that interpretation of it which the sense of the Holy Spirit demands ; and affirmed that heretics of this character might be found within, as well as without, the pale of the visible church.⁸ He saw that Gentile profest proselytes of the outer court, who had intruded themselves within the mystic temple, were in doctrine and life Gentiles still : and protested against them (the resemblance was often noted by his enemies) in the spirit and power of *Vigilantius*.⁹—But his resemblance was even yet more striking to the evangelic bishop *Augustine*.

¹ See Dungal's account of Claude's errors ; also that of Jonas in his *De cultu Imaginum*.

² See Dungal.

³ " Usque hodiè qui *Judaico sensu* Scripturas intelligunt persequuntur ecclesiam Christi, et depopulantur illam : non studio legis Dei, sed traditionibus hominum." Claude on Gal. i. 14.

⁴ See Allix's notice of Claude.

⁵ Faber, p. 314, quotes the following extract given by Allix, from Claude's manuscript Treatise on St. Matthew : " Quia panis corpus confirmat, vinum vero sanguinem operatur in carne, hic ad corpus Christi *mysticè*, illud refertur ad sanguinem." This was I believe originally Bede's expression, occurring in his comment on Luke 22 ; but, being adopted by Claude, it also shows his sentiments.

⁶ See Claude's Commentary on Gal. ii. 8, &c : " Petrum solum (apostolorum) nominat et sibi comparat, quia primatum ipse accepit ad fundandum ecclesiam : se quoque pari modo electum, ut primatum habeat in fundandis Gentium ecclesiis."

⁷ So in the quotation in Note 3.

⁸ " *Hæresis* Græcè ab *electione* dicitur ; quòd scilicet eam sibi unus quisque eligit disciplinam quam putat esse meliorem. Quicumque igitur aliter Scripturam intelligit quàm sensus Spiritus sancti flagrat (*flagitat*) quo conscripta est, licet de ecclesiâ non recesserit, tamen *hæreticus* appellari potest." On Gal. v. 19. B. P. M. 162.—Compare *Bernard Zane's* definition of *heresy* in the 5th Lateran Council ; 1st Session. See p. 81, Note 3 *suprà*.

⁹ So Dungal : " Cognovit quòd illa Hieronymus contrà suum vicinum, suæque auctorem insanis, *Vigilantium* hæreticum scripserit : " and elsewhere. Also Jonas : " Error quem secutus est duorum hæreticorum, Eustathii scilicet et *Vigilantii*."

Him, of all human teachers, he most loved and followed :¹ and, like him, he delighted to set forth *Christ, and divine grace through Him*, as the all in all in man's salvation. Instead of the *Arian* views respecting Christ's person imputed to him, he expressly reprobates them ; and speaks of Christ as very God, consubstantial with the Father.² He represents Him too as the one head of the church :³ and with the utmost fulness, unreserve, and precision, asserts the great doctrine of man's forgiveness and justification, in all ages, through faith alone in Christ's merits ; and not by any works of the law, ceremonial or moral.⁴—At the same time the duty of practical self-denying godliness is enjoined by him. “ Christ Jesus did not command us,” he says, “ to worship the cross, but to bear it ;—to bear it by renouncing the world and ourselves.”⁵ Nor, I believe, has his own exemplification of the rule, and personal holiness of life, ever been questioned.

Such were the truths for the assertion and defence of which Claude became a reproach among his neighbours : insomuch, he writes in one place, “ that they who see us do not only scoff, but point at us : ” and, in another before quoted, “ so that, if the Lord had not helped

¹ In his Preface to the Commentary on St. Matthew, he speaks of Augustine as “ amantissimus Domini, sanctissimus Augustinus, calamus Trinitatis, lingua Spiritûs Sancti,” &c. In effect, judging by what he says himself in the Preface to his Comment on the Galatians, we may suppose very much of his commentaries to have been digested from Augustine.

² So on Gal. iv. 5 : “ Nos beneficio et dignatione misericordiæ ejus filii Dei sumus, ille naturâ est Filius ; qui hoc est quod Pater.” Quoted by Faber, p. 314. To which let me add from his comment on Gal. i. 1 ; (“ An apostle not by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father ;”) “ Ut scias quia Deus est Christus, à quo ille est factus Apostolus, diligentèr adverte quod ante nominaverit Filium quàm Patrem, contrâ calumnias Arrianorum.”—Yet Bossuet, with his usual indifference to truth in questions affecting heretics, scruples not to repeat the charge, and to call him an *Arian*.

³ So in the Epistle to Theutmir above quoted. See also Allix.

⁴ I borrow in the above Mr. Faber's words ; my impression being just the same as his. He quotes the following extracts in proof. “ Lex ostendebat esse peccatum quod illi, per consuetudinem cæcati, possent putare justitiam : ut, hoc modo humiliati, cognoscerent non in suâ manu esse salutem suam, sed in manu Mediatoris.” “ Coguntur fateri non legis operibus justificari hominem sed fide.” “ Non in propriâ justitiâ vel doctrinâ, sed in fide crucis, per quam mihi omnia peccata dimissa sunt.” “ Perdit ergo gratiam Christi, et evangelium quod tenuerat amittit, qui in aliquâ observatione legis se justificari putat.”

⁵ Ep. to Theutmir, quoted by Dungal in the Preface to his work against Claude. B. P. M. xiv. p. 198.

me, they would have swallowed me up quick." The Papal power had not yet established its supremacy in Turin : indeed it had not yet proceeded to deeds of blood, in support of its ever gathering system of superstition : nor had the secular power surrendered itself as an instrument to murder at its bidding. *That* marked the culminating point of the Papal Antichrist. And thus Claude suffered not unto blood. Yet the enmity of the bulk of both priests and people was, as we see, in so far whetted and active against him, as necessarily to have made his prophesying a *prophesying in sackcloth*.

The great effect of Claude's ministry and protestations is testified to by his enemy Dungal. In a passage well deserving perusal, and which is given below,¹ he says that the people of the country embraced in his diocese were separated from each other, and divided into two parts, concerning the observances of the church ; that is, the several superstitious observances above particularized. Nor, we may be sure, in regard of them only ; but also of those evangelic doctrines of grace whence Claude's opposition to the prevailing superstitious practice sprang.²—As to the *local range* through which we

¹ "The people in this region are separated from each other, and divided into two parts, concerning the observances of the church ; that is to say concerning the *images* and *holy pictures* of our Lord's passion. With murmurs and contentions the Catholics say that a picture is good and useful ; and that, for instruction, it is almost as profitable as Holy Scripture itself. But the heretic, on the contrary, and the part seduced by him, say that it is not so ; for that it is a seduction into error, and no other than *idolatry*."

"A similar contention prevails respecting the *Cross*. For the Catholics say that it is good and holy ; that it is a triumphal banner ; and that it is a sign of eternal salvation. But the adverse part, with their master, reply, that it is not so : inasmuch as it only exhibits the opprobrium of the Lord's passion, and the derisive ignominy of his death."

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

² See Milner. Cent. viii. c. 3. p. 436.

may suppose his influence and doctrine to have extended, it is said that the *French* and *Germans* were infected, as well as the *Italians*.¹ More especially we seem justified in the persuasion that such must have been the case in the churches of *Dauphiny*, on the other side of the Cottian Alps; considering both their near neighbourhood, and that, according to credible reports, they were even comprehended at the time in the arch-diocese of *Turin*.²—Nor did the effect soon pass away.³ A notable exemplification of the continued communion of sentiment of the Dauphinese with him, long after his death, occurred in the COUNCIL OF VALENCE, held A. D. 855 :—the which Council was convened, very much with the view of asserting the Augustinian or Claudian *doctrines of grace*, on occasion of the opposition to, and persecution of, the monk *Gotteschalvus*. It seems that, about the year 846, Gottschalc left his monastery in the diocese of Soissons; avowedly, says Hinckmar, with missionary objects :⁴ and that after preaching the Gospel agreeably with *Augustine's* views of it, specially on predestination and election, for a few months in Pannonia, and then afterwards in *Lombardy* and the *Delphinate*, he was recalled by ecclesiastical authority into the north of France, there to give account of his doctrine, and to undergo

¹ "Etiam in Italos, et Gallos, atque Germanos, venenum quod lethaliter potasti utique lethaliter eructasse reperieris." Jonas de Cultu Imag. B. P. M. xiv. 169.

² "Claude, en qualité d'Archeveque de Turin, gouvernait un diocese très étendu ; dans lequel étaient comprises non seulement les vallées du Piemont, mais encore le Dauphiné et la Provence." Abregé des Eglises Esclavonnes et Vaudoises quoted by Muston, i. 197. So too Gilly in his Waldensic Researches, p. 82 : "In some accounts of Claude he is called Bishop of Turin and Embrun."—He in one place speaks of himself as "wielding his pen by day, and by night watching sword in hand on the sea-side against the Saracens and Moors ;" (quoted by Muston, p. 169 ;)—so that his diocese must have come down to the sea-side.—About A. D. 890 we read of subsequent bishops of Embrun flying thence, on occasion of a similar marauding attack of the Saracens. Ibid. 171.

³ Peyrani, the learned Moderator of the Waldenses at the beginning of this present century, in his letter to Napoleon speaks of the Waldensic Churches as having separated from the Roman Church Catholic under Claude of Turin.—But of these Churches, and their Claudian origin, more in a subsequent Section.

⁴ "Contrà suam regulam monasterio egressus disjunctissimas terras peragravit, ut virus suæ falsæ doctrinæ evomeret". Narrat Ecclesia Lugdunensis quo pacto in ultimos fines Germaniæ se contulerit evangelicæ prædicationis gratiâ, et suarum concionum exordium sumpserit ab ineffabili prædicationis mysterio." Hinckmar quoted by Duval, B. P. M. xv. 663.

the persecution of the then two famous archbishops of Mentz and Rheims ; I mean *Rabanus Maurus* and *Hincmar*.¹ By the latter he was condemned, on maintaining these doctrines, as a heretic ; degraded from the priesthood, beaten with rods, and cast into prison : where he lingered, still refusing retractation, till 870 ; and was then, on dying, denied christian burial by Hincmar.²—It is admitted by both Fleury and Dupin that the charges against him were unjust, and that his doctrinal sentiments were only those of Augustine.³ These, however, as being opposed both to natural pride, and to the growing *ecclesiastical semi-Pelagianism*, as well as growing *superstitions*, of Western Christendom, were now unpalatable. Hincmar did but represent on this point the spirit of the world and of the age ;⁴ and so Gottschalc prophesied in sackcloth. But it gave occasion to the Council of *Valence*,—that to which I was just alluding, and at which the metropolitan bishops of Dauphiny, i. e. of *Lyons*, *Vienne*, and *Arles*, with others attended,—solemnly to re-assert the Augustinian doctrines on grace and election, as those which had been continuously handed down to them :⁵ making reference specially to that former Council of *Orange*, held three centuries before under Cæsarius,

¹ See Mosheim ix. 2. 3. 22 &c : also Milner, Cent. ix. ch. 4 ; whose account of Gottschalc, taken very much from Fleury and Dupin, has been eulogized by Dean Waddington as discriminating and impartial. See also the notice of Gottschalc by Duval, Doctor of the Sorbonne, subjoined to the *Liber Eccles.* Lugd. which last is referred to in a note on the next page. B. P. M. xv. 663.

² Waddington, p. 260.

³ See Milner, *ibid.*

⁴ “Hincmar paid his sedulous devotions to the Virgin, (this appears from the Epitaph written by himself,) and was infected with other superstitions of the age.” Waddington, p. 253.

⁵ Hard. v. 88. “De præscientiâ Dei, et de prædestinatione, et de questionibus aliis in quibus fratrum animi non parum scandalazati probantur, illud tantum firmissimè tenendum esse credimus, quod ex maternis ecclesiæ visceribus nos hausisse gaudemus.” The “other questions” appear from the Canons to have been those on *grace*. There is a reference in the 4th canon to the attacks on Gottschalcus. In the 2nd, like the Council of Orange, they strongly guard against the abuse of the doctrine of predestination, as if involving reprobation. The whole record of the Council well deserves perusal. Its first six Canons are *doctrinal*, laying down the principles of Augustine in regard to man’s salvation : the other seventeen *practical*, inculcating arrangements for the effective provision of a well-prepared clergy, and right administration of ecclesiastical duties.—In the 21st canon there is an expression on the “*redemptio peccatorum*” of which the propriety seems more than questionable : but possibly in this, and similar phrases, that meet us in Cæsarius’ Homilies, &c, we may explain the term somewhat in the sense of Dan. iv. 27.

which I have already noticed,¹ as their example and pattern. And we have Treatises yet later on the same subject, emanating from the Lyonnese Church; and exhibiting still the same decided adhesion to the doctrines of Augustine.²

Thus we advance towards the close of the ixth century: and, in doing so, we advance also into a period of deep obscurity, especially as regards the history of Piedmont.—There is noticed by Bishop Newton a *Council* held at *Trosly* near Soissons, in the year A. D. 909; at the conclusion of which a Confession of faith was made, including none of those superstitions which constitute the essence of Popish doctrine,—“of the Pope’s supremacy, of the sacrifice of the mass, of purgatory, of the worship of creatures, or of commentitious sacra-

¹ “Sicut Arausica Synodus.” So in canons 3 and 6.—See *suprà*, p. 208.

² See the *Ecclesiæ Lugdunensis Liber* against John Scot, one of Gottschale’s enemies; also the Treatise of *Prudentius*, in the B. P. M. xv. 611, 592, &c. The former at p. 619, refers to Gottschale, as having been irregularly condemned, and at that time long incarcerated:—“infelicissimo monacho jam dudum illic (nescimus quo ordine) damnato, et annis jam plurimis carcerali ergastulo re-tuso, nomine Gotteschalco.” The date of the Treatise may therefore probably have not long preceded A. D. 870.

This *Book of the Lyonnese Church* against Scotus Erigena is of some length, occupying above fifty pages in the Bibliotheca; and thoroughly and all through imbued with the evangelic doctrine of Augustine. I cannot think it right to pass on without giving the following extract on man’s redemption by Christ as a specimen.

“Amisso dono gratiæ, vitiato et corrupto et depravato bono naturæ, sic miserabiliter homo à tantâ felicitate lapsus est, ut ad illud bonum amandum et perfruendum cui inhære debuerat, nullum possit habere recursum nisi per misericordissimi Reconciliatoris et Mediatoris auxilium, et sanguinis ejus pretium: à quo redimimur de tantâ captivitate, ut recipere possimus pristinam libertatem, et de inimicis efficiamur amici. De quo Mediatore scriptum est, ‘Unus enim Deus et Mediator Dei et hominum, homo Christus Jesus, qui dedit seipsum redemptionem pro omnibus.’ Et iterum; ‘Cùm inimici essemus reconciliati sumus Deo per mortem Filii ejus.’ (1 Tim. ii. 5. Rom. v. 10). Quicumque ergo dicit post illam transgressionis infelicissimam ruinam, quâ, amissâ pristina libertate, factus est servus peccati, factus et inimicus Dei,—post hanc, inquam, tam magnam ruinam quicumque dicit eum habuisse vel habere libertatem ad verum bonum appetendum, amandum, et promerendum, nisi per gratiam veri Mediatoris redimatur, justificetur, reconcilietur, et reformetur, omnino contrâ fidem Ecclesiæ sentit, contrâ veritatem evangelicam et apostolicam docet, et omnino (quantum in se est) evacuator est crucis Christi, evacuator mortis Christi.” B. P. M. p. 622.

There is in the Treatise a passage, p. 646 where purgatorial fire is spoken of, which is supplied, says the Editor, from another manuscript, being in the one chiefly used wholly wanting. It seems to me to be an interpolation. The Treatise is throughout most evangelical in doctrine; and another exemplification of the incalculable use of Augustine, in God’s Providence, to the preservation of a witness for Christ’s truth through the dark ages.

ments.”¹ And thus it is a testimony of much interest; though not undefective, nor in the local districts which our review chiefly contemplates. Again Mr. Faber has a reference,² locally more in point, to a notice in the Letters of *Atto*, *Bishop of Vercelli* near Turin, A. D. 945, of certain false teachers, known among the common people by the name of *Prophets*; who taught them, *Atto* says, diabolical error, and induced them to forsake their priests and their Holy Mother the Church: ³ respecting whom Mr. Faber conjectures that they were *Vaudois* dissentients, long since *fixed in their Alpine settlement*, making missionary incursions into the plain of Turin and Vercelli. But clearer evidence is needed to show the class and character of these *Prophets*. It seems to me that we must admit a partial gap in the line of evidence; but rest on the obscurity of Piedmontese history in this earlier middle age,—an obscurity recognised by *Muratori*,⁴—as sufficiently accounting for it.

And hence indeed very much the doubtfulness that besets the question, (a question that will come up again in my 6th Section) whether any distinct colony of dissentients from the Romish Church were as yet settled in what were subsequently the Alpine vallies of the *Vaudois*. I think there were none so fixed before the time of *Claude of Turin*. For I have observed in *Warnfrid's History of the Lombards* a curious notice of the *Cottian Alps*, hitherto unREFERRED to, I believe, in the *Waldensian controversy*; which states the formal donation of that

¹ See *Harduin* vi. 544, &c.

² Book iii. ch. v. p. 330.

³ In the 60th chapter of his *Capitulare* the Clergy is advised to avoid the deeper theological questions that might meet, or be brought before them; “quia ad confitendum gratiam Dei, ejus operi ac dignationi nihil penitus subtrahendum est, satis sufficere credimus quidquid, secundum prædictas regulas Apostolicæ Sedis, nos Scriptura docuerit: ut prorsus non opinemur catholicum quod apparuit præfixis sententiis esse contrarium.” (*Dacher. Spicil.* i. 408. Ed. 1723.) It seems to me inferable from this, that the deeper questions prohibited were those of *Augustine* concerning *grace*: to which questions *Gottshalk's* preaching in Lombardy, and subsequent history and fate, noised far and near, was likely to have attached in those parts an increased and not passing interest.

⁴ “He says that he could gather little more from the early history of Piedmont than this,—that in the middle ages the principality was constantly passing under different sovereigns, and that the people took advantage of these changes to obtain grants favourable to their rights and privileges.” *Gilly Wald. Res.* p. 74, from *Muratori's Præfat.* in *Chron. Ast.* and in *Hist. Monteser.*

district,—“ the patrimony of the Cottian Alps,”—by two successive Lombard kings, about the years 710 and 730, to the Roman see :¹ but without any concurrent notice of its being inhabited by a colony of religionists, distinct from their neighbours in the plain of Piedmont. Again in Claude’s own account of the religious state of things at the time of his entering on the Episcopate of Turin, he speaks of the whole multitude as given to idolatry, and of himself as setting to oppose it alone :²—a statement scarce consistent with the fact of the existence of any very remarkable and distinct colony of precisely the same sentiments, that had retired from the plain and city in consequence of the prevailing superstition, and were then resident in the not very distant vallies of his diocese. It seems to me rather that a purer and more simple faith had remained with the original Alpine mountaineers, just as with their Augustinian brethren on the other side the Alps in Dauphiny, during the two or three preceding centuries ;—centuries in the course of which the Latin tongue had been undergoing its mutations, and the Alpine dialect forming into its peculiar Patois :—and that *after Claude’s death* the people of the plains that held his sentiments, under the pressure of increasing persecution, *gradually* drew off more and more to the

¹ “ Hoc tempore (about 710) Aripertus, Dux Longobardorum, donationem patrimonii Alpium Cottiarum, quæ quondam ad jus pertinuerant Apostolicæ sedis, sed a Longobardis multo tempore fuerant ablata, restituit : et hanc donationem aureis exaratam literis Romam direxit.” Ch. 28.—Again : “ Eo tempore Luitbrandus Rex donationem patrimonii Alpium Cottiarum Romanæ Ecclesiæ confirmavit.” Ch. 43. This was after Charles Martel’s accession, and before the great battle of Tours ; consequently about A. D. 730.

It was not very long after this that Luitbrand and his successor Astulphus took Ravenna, and menaced Rome ; on which followed the interventions of Pepiu and Charlemagne. And it would seem as if in these revolutions some new arrangement was made respecting the Cottian Alps, and the donation to the Roman see cancelled. For De Marca, in his work on the Primacy of Lyons and other churches, observes that the Province of the Cottian Alps was not allotted to any diocese, though every other region in Italy and Gaul was assigned to some metropolitan see. Gilly Wald. Res. p. 65.

Since writing the above I observe that Sir I. Newton, in his book on Daniel, p. 80, (Ed. 1831) asserts this donation of the Alpes Cotticæ to the Pope to be, like the so called donation of Constantine, a fiction ; because, says he, the Alpes Cotticæ were a part of the Exarchate, and in the days of Aripert belonged to the Greek Emperor. But he does not state his authority for the assertion ; and Ado in his Chronicon (ad ann. 699) makes twice over the same statement. B. P. M. xvi. 802, 803.

² See p. 219 *suprà*.

hills, and there intermingled and united with the original inhabitants and the sub-Alpine Dauphinese: yet still not by any formal act of colonization; nor so as to leave none, or few, of their sentiments in the Piedmontese plain or cities. Thus we may fairly, I think, go so far with Mr. Faber, as to conjecture that it is to *some* of these spiritual descendants of Claude that what is said by the above-mentioned Vercellian bishop Atto may probably be referred, about the false teachers, called *Prophets* by the people, who in his time, about A. D. 945, seduced them to desert their priests and their churches.—Again it is from them that we may with yet more confidence consider the sect to have descended, which we read of as discovered A. D. 1030 at Turin: ¹ of which it is said that they received the Holy Scriptures alone as the rule of doctrine, rejected the formal observances and rites of the Romish church, and followed a strict rule of life.² This last-mentioned historical notice, seems to me indeed especially, important; and will be observed on by me hereafter,³ as a corroboration of Rorenco's and Genebrard's authoritative assertions, made as if from evidence before them, that Claude's religious opinions were propagated and continued in Piedmont through the ixth and xth centuries.⁴

And thus it is that we enter on the opening of the xith century, a time much to be noted in the history of Witnesses in the West: it being the æra of the *Councils*

¹ Muston i. 163, from Schmidt's *Mysticism of the Middle Age*.

² Mr. Faber, Book iii. c. 6, refers to an Epistle from the monk P. Damian to the Duchess of Savoy, who was also Marchioness of the Cottian Alps, of the date 1050, which notices the clergy of the diocese of Turin as determinately marrying. In this however they were not singular. In many different countries the Popes had to fight a hard battle before enforcing the celibate.—In his next chapter he gives an extract from a Chronicle of Rodolph of St. Trudon, as evidence that about 1125 there was a sect of anti-transubstantiationists in the Cottian Alps. It seems to me extraordinary that Mr. Faber should so have interpreted the narrative: seeing that it speaks of these heretics as in a district "ad quam *ulterius* disposuerat peregrinari," and consequently *further South than Rome*; since Rodolph had come from France and the North. Dr. Gilly has fallen into the same palpable error, as it seems to me; (see his *Wald. Res.* p. 88;) and before them both Peyran, the Waldensian Pastor. (See his *Waldenses*, p. 35 Sims' Translation.) ³ In my Section 6 *infra*.

⁴ See Gilly, p. 85, &c.

of *Orleans* and *Arras*, in which heretics and heresies were condemned that had been imported, it is said, from *Italy*; ¹ and which introduced and was followed by that of *Berenger*,² *Arnold of Brescia*, *Peter de Bruys*, and his disciple *Henry*, and in fine of the *Waldenses*.—Before speaking of these however, it may be well to trace in a separate Section a distinct line of confessors for scriptural evangelic truth, who coterminously or nearly so with *Serenus* and *Claude of Turin* had kept up a witnessing for Christ and God's word in the *East*; and afterwards in the xth and xith centuries, having migrated into the *West*, seem then and there to have intermingled with the *Western* witnessing body for Christ. I refer, as the reader will anticipate, to the body known under the name of *Paulicians* in ecclesiastical history; or, as I prefer to call them for a reason afterwards given, with the slight change of one letter, *Paulikians*.

§ 3.—THE EASTERN OR PAULIKIAN LINE OF WITNESSES.

As regards this line of Witnesses, perplexities and obscurities arise chiefly from the circumstance of the loss of the writings of those in whom we think to trace it. The *PAULIKIANS*,—those to whom I refer,—are known to us only through the reports of bitter enemies, who brand them as *heretics*. And *Bossuet*, and *Maitland*, and *Dowling*,³ and many others, acquiescing implicitly

¹ See p. 243, 248, *infra*. It is difficult to determine decisively in the case of the *Orleanist* sectaries and those at *Arras*, whether they had an Eastern or a Western origin; it being only said that the teachers of the heresy came from the borders of *Italy*. But it is quite competent to the inquirer, as I shall have again to observe, to refer them to a Western origin, if so he prefer. The heretics at *Cologne* constitute the first *indubitable* example of sectaries of an *Eastern* or *Greek* origin in Western Europe.

² *Berenger's* connexion with *Italy* is noted by *Matthew of Westminster* on the year 1087: "Berengarius omnes Gallos, Italos, et Anglos, suis jam pæne corruerat pravitatibus." *Faber* 158. And though this has reference to his *influence*, not *origin*, yet it marks *connexion*, which may not improbably have been earlier.

³ The *former* in his *Book on the Waldenses*, and *Letter addressed to Dr. Mill*, containing *Strictures on Faber*;—the *latter* in his *Pamphlet on the Paulikians*.

in the hostile testimonies against them, both admit and re-echo the charge. To myself the exercise of a spirit of caution, and even of suspiciousness, in the matter, seems dictated alike by common sense and common equity; at the same time that I am not unaware of the possibility of carrying that suspiciousness too far. On the whole I may truly say that I have given to the evidence as candid, and also careful consideration, as I am able. And the conclusion I have found myself *forced to* by it is this;—that the charges of *heresy* made against them have no consistent or sufficient evidence to rest on; and that, on the other hand, from the general facts of their history, from the unwilling admissions in their favour of the hostile chroniclers, and even from the nature of the particular charges of heresy made against them, the inference is warranted, that at first the general body of the *Paulikians*, and afterwards, as they multiplied, particular bands out of it, were faithful witnesses for Christ. The facts of the case will now be set fully before the reader:—at least sufficiently so to enable him to judge for himself whether the conclusion I have formed be warranted by the evidence or not.

I now proceed then to sketch *the rise and subsequent history of the PAULIKIAN SECT*, up to the time of their westward migrations in the 11th and 12th centuries:—it being reserved for a later occasion to discuss *characteristics* of them that seem well to agree *primâ facie* with those given of Christ's two Witnesses in the Apocalyptic prophecy; as also certain *charges of heresy* made against them, and the grounds and probable falsehood of those charges.

The sect thus began. In the year A. D. 653, soon after the Saracenic conquest of Syria, an Armenian named *Constantine*, residing near Samosata, received from a Deacon whom he had hospitably entertained on his return from captivity in Syria, the present of two volumes, then very rare; one containing the four Gospels,

the other the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul. (Did not the giver's advice and prayers accompany the gift: not without others sympathizing, and so furnish to the sect an earlier origin? ¹) It is reported by the narrator,² that he had been educated previously in the principles of *Manicheism*. However this might be, the perusal of these sacred books caused a revolution in his professed principles, and whole subsequent course of life. Separating alike from Manichean or other heretics, and from the established but now apostate Church of Greek Christendom, he applied himself thenceforward to the formation of a distinct Christian sect or church: a sect consisting of such as might be willing, with himself, to found their faith and practice on the simple rule of those sacred books;—the only part, apparently, then possessed by him or them of God's written Word. In the missionary labours whereby he sought to accomplish this his object, (and indefatigable those labours seem to have been,) he likened himself to a disciple of St. Paul. "I," said he, "am *Sylvanus*; you the *Macedonians*:"³—thus intimating that it was the doctrine of *St. Paul*, very specially, that he wished himself to teach, and them to follow. And they, acquiescing in his views, adopted, as if in public token of this their profession, the name which has thenceforth ever attached to them of PAULIKIANI, or *disciples of the disciple of St. Paul*.⁴—Now

¹ Compare the account of the foreign heretic A. D. 650, given Note 3. p. 213.

² I mean *Petrus Siculus*, who is the principal and most authentic historian on the subject. He wrote his history about A. D. 870, when the Paulikian sect and community was flourishing; having collected the account, as he tells us, during a residence of nine months at Tephrike, their capital. B. P. M. xvi. 754. Besides him *Photius*, his cotemporary, the famous Archbishop of Constantinople, wrote on the Paulikian history; and, two centuries after, *Cedrenus*. See Dowling.

³ See 1 Thess. i. 1.

⁴ That the name of *Paulikians* was assumed by *themselves*, and with a view to mark their profession as *followers of St. Paul*, is admitted by *Photius*: for he says in one place, *και γαρ επιγραφονται τετον'* (i. e. St. Paul;) and, in another, *οὐ ψευδωνυμοι παραγραφονται*. (Lib. iii. 42, ii. 190, quoted by Mr. Dowling.) And so too *Petrus Siculus* B. P. M. xvi. 758; "Quasi a Christo, atque doctrinâ præconis rectæ fidei Pauli Apostoli, hanc detestandam sectam acceperint." Besides which the very remarkable custom, kept up for above two centuries among them, of their chief teachers assuming, together with the pastoral charge, the name of one of St. Paul's disciples and companions commemorated in the New Testament,—as Constantine that of *Sylvanus*, Simeon that of *Titus*, Paul of *Episparis* that of *Timothy*, *Sergius* that of *Tychicus*, &c,—is evidence of the fact as unanswerable

supposing Constantine sincere in his profession, it needs not to say how noble the enterprize; or again how strikingly, if carried out, it must have been a witnessing for Christ, in the midst of the prevailing superstitions and apostacy. His sincerity has however been impeached. The reader must all through bear this in mind. The historians from whom the narrative is taken, assert that it was done *hypocritically*; and in order, by means of the words of Scripture perverted, to propagate more safely, as well as insidiously, the principles of *Manicheism*. Yet they agree that he burnt all his Manichean books, abjured Manicheism, and made it a law to his followers not to read any other book whatsoever, but the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament:—moreover that these Gospels and Epistles were unadulterated by the Paulikians, and both received and preserved in precisely the same words as the authentic copies of the Greek Church.¹

The ministrations of Constantine were prolonged for

as palpable. Their churches too were named after St. Paul's churches; the *Macedonians*, *Achaians*, *Philippians*, *Ephesians*, *Colossians*. Cedrenus ap. Dowling, p. 15.

As to the formation of the word *Paulikians*, great but very needless difficulties, as it seems to me, have been made about it, alike by ancients and moderns. Instead of being "so strangely formed," as Mr. Dowling says, (p. 13,) it needs but to trace it back to its root, precisely according to the analogy of derivatives of similar termination, in order to see its simple and natural explanation. If *Χριστιανος* is derived from *Χριστος*, and *Henricianus* from *Henricus*, from what may we suppose *Παυλικιανος* derived, but from *Παυλικος*? Again from what *Παυλικος* but *Παυλος*? just as *κοσμικος* from *κοσμος*, *Σωκρατικος* from *Σωκρατης*, &c.?—Which being so, we have only to reverse the process in the application. In assuming the name of *Sylvanus*, *Tychicus*, &c., both Constantine and other teachers of the sect after him, proclaimed themselves to the world, as not *Socratics*, not *Platonics*, but *Paulics*, i. e. followers of St. Paul. So *Petrus Siculus* says of *Sergius*, "Cognomentum assumens *Tychici*, cujus nomen est celebre in *Epistolis Pauli*, *Pauli discipulum* se vulgo jactavit." Which being the teacher's profession and title, that of their followers was as naturally *Paulikiani*, or *disciples of a disciple of St. Paul*. (I adopt the English appellation *Paulikians*, in preference to *Paulicians*, as better suiting by the sound this derivation, than the other does.)—The absurd torturing of the word, in order to make it a corruption from the supposed barbarophonic title *Παυλοϊωαννοι*, the compound of the names of two *Manicheans* of *Samosata*, named *Paul* and *John*, that lived some time before Constantine, deserves remark, as shewing the *animus* of the writer; especially considering the Paulikians' confest condemnation of this Paul: "promptissimè damnant *Paulum Samosatenum*." Nor indeed is its explanation as a corruption from *Παυλιανοι*, in the sense of *Disciples of Paul* of *Samosata*, much more felicitous. See *Petrus Sic.* B. P. M. xvi. 759, Marg. and 760.

¹ Thus *Petrus Siculus*, after enumerating the Books of the New Testament received by them, ("Sacra quatuor Evangelia et Pauli Apostoli denas quaternas

a period of near 30 years. Then at length, the sect having become sufficiently considerable to attract notice, an edict of persecution was issued against him and his Paulikian congregations by the Greek government; and the execution of the edict entrusted to an officer of the Imperial Palace, named Simeon. In the fulfilment of it Constantine was stoned to death. But from the stoning of Constantine, as from that of the proto-martyr Stephen, a new head to the Paulikian remnant was raised up in the person of his murderer. Impressions were made on *Simeon* by what he had seen and heard, that he could not shake off. For three years, we are told, he secluded himself in his own home, reflecting on it; then, having made up his resolution, *left all*,¹—the necessary sacrifice, it seems, involved in the step he was taking; and, joining himself to those whom before he persecuted, became their new head and chief teacher.—The report of the revival of the heresy after a while reached the ears of a neighbouring Bishop; and by him was communicated to the then Emperor, Justinian II. On this the Imperial mandate was again issued against the sectaries; and Simeon, and a large number of his followers, convened to answer the charge. They were interrogated each separately on their tenets, and opportunity offered them for retractation. But in vain. They continued pertinacious in what was deemed their errors. Which being the case, a vast funeral pile was constructed, near the heap piled up in Constantine's memory: and they were all thrown on it; and burnt alive.²

Still the heresy, as it was called, rose again from its ashes. One *Paul* who had with his two sons escaped

Epistolas recipiunt, Jacobi item Catholicam, ternas Johannis, Catholicam Judæ, et Actus Apostolorum,") adds, "iisdem quibus apud nos sunt verbis." B. P. M. 756. Photius gives a precisely similar testimony to the genuineness of the Paulikian Scriptures. And so too Cedrenus, two centuries after.

¹ "Quos quidem dum temerè nimis auscultat Simeon, . . . pestiferam hæresim hausit, et cùm eâ rediit Constantinopolim ad Imperatorem. Triennio deinde domi suæ privatim acto, cùm plenè jam irretitus possideretur à Diabolo, *relictis omnibus*, clam excessit, Cibosam petens." Ib. 760.

² "Extructo ad acervum iugenti rogo, incensi et cremati omnes fuerunt." Ibid. He had previously mentioned this *heap* raised over Constantine: "Locus ipse hodiè que ob lapidum congeriem *Acervus* nuncupatur."

to Episparis,—and, after him, one of those two sons, *Genæsius surnamed Timothy*, (who, summoned before the Patriarch, witnessed even by Petrus's admission a good confession,¹)—and then three other teachers named *Zacharias, Epaphroditus, and Bahanes*, perpetuated the sect through the *eighth* century. In the course of which century, as I must pointedly remark in passing, there occurred that grand movement against *image-worship* that I have alluded to in my Chapter on the Saracens:² and respecting which it is asserted both by Hamartolus, a nearly cotemporary historian,³ and others, that though participated in by many others of the Greeks,—some from purer motives, we may be sure,⁴ some from motives political and earthly,—it was originated by the *Paulikians*.—At length, just as that century was expiring, there arose to head the sect another teacher, more eminent perhaps than all before, named *Sergius*. The circumstances of his conversion to Paulikianism from the established religion, or rather established apostacy, are observable; and thus narrated by Petrus Siculus, his bitter enemy.⁵ “A woman addressed him, while he was yet a young man: ‘I hear, Sir, that thou excellest in science and literary erudition, and art moreover, in

¹ B. P. M. *ibid.* I shall hereafter have to remark in detail on this important record of Genæsius' examination.

² See Vol. i: p. 437.

³ Hamartolus' age may be with probability inferred from the date at which his Chronicle ends, viz. A. D. 842. He designates the *iconoclastic* system as, *ἡ τῶν ἀλιτηρίων καὶ κακοσχολῶν εἰκονομαχῶν ἐμβροντητῆος αἵρεσις*.—The testimony of G. Monachus (a writer of about the middle of the 10th century) is to the same effect. He says that “the Iconoclasts were the protectors of the demoniacal worship of the Manicheans,” i. e. Paulikians; “from whom in fact they derived their origin.” Dowling, 41, 45.

⁴ “They (the image-worshippers) were now opposed by the murmurs of many simple or rational Christians: who appealed to the evidence of texts, of facts, and of the primitive times, and secretly desired the reformation of the Church.” Gibbon ix. 122.

⁵ The following strain of invectives against Sergius by Petrus Siculus deserves attention, both as showing the spirit of the latter, and also as exhibiting what he could alone rake up to say against the former. “Sergius ille Diaboli maximus propugnator,—Sergius qui multos ex ovibus lupos fecit, et per eos Christi ovilia dissipavit,—Sergius acer ipse sub ovina pelle lupus, virtutum fraudulentus simulator, quippe hac arte multis fucum faciebat,—Sergius inimicus crucis Christi,—os impietatis,—in Christi Matrem Sanctosque contumeliosus,—Sergius Christi apostolorum adversarius,—qui et Prophetas odio habuit, et à divinis literis versus ad fabulas et mendacia se convertit,—Sergius Christi osor,—ecclesiæ perduellis,—qui Dei Filium conculcavit, et sanguinem Testamenti pollutum duxit, et Spiritui gratiæ contumeliam fecit.” Pet. Sic. Hist. B. P. M. 761.

every respect, of good and moral character. Tell me, then, why dost thou not read the sacred Gospels ?'—On his answering to which question, ' It is not lawful for us of the *laity* to read them, but only for the *Priests*,' she rejoined ; ' It is not as thou supposest. For there is no acceptance of persons with God : since God willeth all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. But your Priests, because they adulterate God's word, and hide the mysteries contained in the Gospels, do therefore avoid reading to you, their auditors, *all* things therein written ; but read *some* things, and omit *others*, that so ye may not come to the knowledge of the truth.' Then referring to the text, ' Many will say to me in that day, Lord have we not in thy name cast out dæmons, and done many virtues ; and the King answering shall say, I know you not,'¹ and again that other, ' Many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, but the children of the kingdom will be cast into outer darkness,' she applied them, on Sergius hesitating as to the meaning, to them that were the holy ones of the Greeks, their priests, exorcists, ' whom ye venerate, she said, as Deities, the living and immortal Lord being left by you.'—In the same style running through sundry passages of the Gospel more in detail, and giving a perverted sense to them, so as she saw him ready to receive it, she so corrupted his mind as to render him in a little time an apt instrument of the devil." Such, I say, is the account of his conversion, given by the hostile historian Petrus Siculus ; and which seems to me too characteristic to allow of omission, indeed hardly of abridgment.¹ After which Sergius became for some 34 years the chief minister and head of the Paulikians : having, like his predecessors, adopted the name of one of St. Paul's followers, *Tychicus*, in token of his *professedly*, at least, expounding and propagating that apostle's doctrine. His spirit was eminently *missionary* : and his laboriousness and activity

¹ My translation is literal. The Latin is given in the B. P. M. *ibid*.

such, that in one of his letters, written in later life, he thus expressed himself; “From East to West, and from North to South, I have run preaching the Gospel of Christ, and labouring with these my hands.”² The words seemed to Petrus like words of boasting. At the same time he bears testimony, incidentally, and we may say unintentionally, to Sergius’s sincerity of motive in his labours. It was his object, he says, to deliver his countrymen from what he now considered as their *fatal error*.¹—And he adds that a success attended him not incommensurate with this his laboriousness. Not of the laity only, but even of “Priests and Levites, Monks and Nuns,”² many were induced by him to join the Paulikian sect, and indeed to become teachers in it. Thus it grew and multiplied greatly.

It was in the course of these 34 years of Sergius’ ministry that a severe persecution was begun and carried on against them, by command of the Emperors Michael Rhangabe and Leo, and at the instigation of the patriarch Nicephorus.³ On this some of the Paulikians, now grown numerous, resisted: and they at length took up a position of defence on Mount Argæus,

¹ “Quod ipsemet in quâdam Epistolâ gloriatur his verbis; Ab Oriente inquit, usque ad Occasum, à Boreâ ad Austrum cucurri, nuncians Evangelium Christi, et manibus * meis laborans.” Ibid. 762. In this passage three things deserve notice: Sergius’ *public* assertion of his *preaching* being that of *Christ’s Gospel*;—the fact of his *making no gain* by it, but supporting himself, like St. Paul, by the labors of his hands;—and that of Petrus Siculus’ *acquaintance with the Letter*, as being, together with other Letters of Sergius then read in the Paulikian Churches, still extant and well known in his time; and from which he *might have quoted* fully therefore, had he pleased, in corroboration of his statements.

As to Sergius’ *boast*, if such it be called, we may compare it with St. Paul’s, his professed exemplar; “From Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ.” Rom. xv. 19.

² “Cum crederet omnes, qui sinceram et illibatam Christianorum fidem nostram ac pietatem colunt, in *pernicie versari*.” Ibid.

³ Petrus Siculus’ expression.

⁴ Theophanes apud Dowling. p. 41. Theophanes makes use of the occasion to inveigh against certain who had endeavoured to dissuade the Emperor from granting Nicephorus’ call for persecution, on the plea that it was not fit for spiritual persons to pass sentence of capital punishment on the impious. For in this, he says, they were in direct variance with the Scriptures; where Peter is noted as passing sentence of death on Ananias and Sapphira!

* In my Bibliotheca the word is *genibus*: which I presume is a misprint for *manibus*.

near Cæsarea in Cappadocia ;¹ a position in which the neighbourhood of the Saracens proved to them, in the event, to be an additional protection.² In regard of Sergius himself, however, he *dissuaded them from resistance*:³ and at length he ended his own course by the accidental stroke of an axe of a woodcutter: “ a fit punishment,” says the historian, “ for one who had so divided the Church of Christ.”⁴ This was about the year A. D. 830.—His memory afterwards continued sacred among the Paulikians ; and the letters that he had addressed from time to time to their different churches were added, Petrus Siculus says, to their copies of the New Testament :—not indeed as of the Canon of inspired Scripture, (we know to the contrary,⁵) but as that which was in spirit closely allied to it: in the same way, doubtless, as the Epistles of *Clement* were by the early Christians appended to the volume of Sacred Scripture, and read in their Churches.⁶

It was not long after Sergius’ death that the Paulikian sectaries were visited by a far severer persecution, originated by direction of the Empress Theodora. And both the severity of the persecution, and the numbers of the sect, may be judged of by the multitudes said to have been sacrificed in it. Reckoning together those that were drowned in the sea, and those that were put to the sword, the numbers stated are not less than 100,000.⁷

¹ I find this mountain represented in a medallion of the Emperor Macrinus, given in Montfaucon, vi. 125.

² Compare Apoc. ix. 4. The Saracens were to be a scourge only to those who (collectively and as a community) had not the seal of God on their foreheads.

³ Petrus Siculus allows this ; but says that though he urged forbearance on his followers, and expressed his disapprobation of their retaliating, yet he ought to bear the blame of it : because, if he could not restrain his disciples, he ought not to have been their teacher. B. P. M. 762.

⁴ B. P. M. 763.—He dates his death by the Mundane æra, A. M. 6303 : from which we see that Petrus and the Greeks still followed the Septuagint Chronology.

⁵ Cedrenus a subsequent historian, gives the canon of the New Testament recognised by the Paulikians, without addition.

⁶ Petrus Siculus speaks of these letters as “ full of pride and impiety ; ” but scarce *ever quotes them* ; and then only in brief and garbled extracts. These I shall give in a subsequent Section.

⁷ This was A. D. 846. So the Continuator of Theophanes apud Dowling, p. 43 —Gibbon, (x. 177,) observes on this persecution, “ Many simple *Iconoclasts* were punished under a more odious name ; ” i. e. the name of *Manichæans*. The

On this, like the Albigenses, the Hussites, the Piedmontese Waldenses, and the French Calvinists of after times, the Paulikians determined on more decided resistance to their persecutors: and under Carbeas, previously an officer of high rank in the Imperial Service, but who had now (whether converted to their views by the persecuted, or disgusted with their persecutors) deserted to them, fortified themselves on Mount Tephric in Armenia, and maintained a war of various success, until at length reduced by the first Basil.—In the progress of this war if cruelties were sometimes retaliated on their injurers, who can wonder? It is to be remembered, however, that after they had multiplied and strengthened into a powerful community, it was not the whole of them, any more than the whole body of Hussites, Waldenses, or other orthodox sects just enumerated, that we presume to have been Christian Witnesses; but such only among them (and such I believe were not wanting) as acted still, like Sergius and his predecessors, in the true Christian evangelic spirit.—Now it was here, and about this time, that *Petrus Siculus*, the historian to whom we have so often referred as the most authentic on the subject,—the *Reinerius Saccho*, if I may so say, of the *Paulikian heresy*,—being sent on the mission by Basil, visited and spent nine months among them. The date is given by himself as 868 A. D. And I wish to take this opportunity of noting cursorily the heresies he charges on them; his authority being, as he tells us, in part that of *personal* observation, in part that of the *reports* of the Catholics or Christians of the Established Church, resident in the neighbourhood: ¹—1st. that of holding, like the Manicheans, two principles, or two Gods, an evil and a good, the one the creator of this world, the other of the world to come; 2ndly, that of dishonouring the Virgin Mary,² and discrediting the fact of Christ's being born of her, forasmuch as he brought,

attachment indeed of this term of reproach to the Iconoclasts is notorious. Mr. Dowling notices the fact in his Pamphlet.

¹ Dowling, p. 30.

² And *the saints* too. See the Note 4 p. 234 *suprà*.

they said, his body from Heaven ; 3rdly, the denial of the conversion of the eucharistic elements into Christ's body and blood ; 4thly, the dishonouring of the material cross ; 5thly, the rejection of the Old Testament from the Scripture Canon ; 6thly, the repudiation of the established ministry of priests and presbyters ;—their own chief ministers being called, as both Petrus Siculus and Photius observe in their accounts of the sect, *Συνεκδημοι*, or *Comperegrini*, the younger and inferior *Notarii*.¹—The same Photius adds, as a further charge against them, that of rejecting Baptism ; and others inveigh bitterly, as indeed already noticed, against their enmity to the worship of the sacred images.²—I reserve the examination of these charges for a later Section.

The subsequent history of the Paulikians is *European*.—They had already in the year 756, under direction of the Emperor Constantine Copronymus, detached a colony, which acted also as a religious mission, to *Thrace*.³ A century after, and just while Petrus Siculus was among them, they appear to have strengthened this by a second.⁴ Yet another century after (about A. D. 970) the Emperor John Zimisces,—whether, as Zonaras reports, at the request of the Patriarch of Antioch, “because that they still *corrupted many with their heresy*,” (this connecting link of the chain that testifies to their continued missionary enterprize and work will not be lost upon the reader,)—or, as Anna Comnena, from his appreciation of their faithfulness and courage,—from one or other, I say, of these two motives, Zimisces removed the rest across the Bosphorus, and settled them on the Northern frontier of the Empire ; free toleration being now granted, and the city and district of *Philippopolis* given

¹ B. P. M. 763.—The word is used, Acts xix. 29, and 2 Cor. viii. 19 ; to which, as also to 2 Cor. v. 6, as illustrative of its meaning, I shall have to refer hereafter.

² See p. 234.

³ ‘Ο δε βασιλευς Κωνσταντινος Συρος τε και Αρμενιες ες ηγαγεν απο Θεοδοσιου-τολεως και Μελιτινης, εις Θρακην μετακησεν’ εξ ων επληθυνθη η αμαρτια των Πανλικιανων. Theophanes Chronograph. apud Dowling, p. 40.

⁴ Petrus Siculus addresses his history to the Archbishop of the Bulgarians, in order, as he says, to put him on his guard against the heretics ; who, he had learnt, were at that time just about sending a mission into Bulgaria.

them in possession.¹—There Cedrenus (whose account of the heresy, mainly agreeable to that of Petrus Siculus, will be noticed hereafter) describes them as living in the 11th century.² There the Emperor Alexius Comnenus vainly attempted to convert them to the so called Catholic faith, at the commencement of the 12th. There again the Latin Crusaders that conquered Constantinople found them in the year 1204. The which last-mentioned, speak of them under the name of *Popolicani* or *Poplicani* ;³—a name corrupted, as I conceive, from a confusion of their proper title of *Paulikiani* (pronounced by the Greeks *Pavlikiani*) with the adjective of locality formed from the name of their then chief city of residence *Philippopolis*.⁴—And by this name, I must now observe, as well as by their tenets and the known migratory course of certain bands of their community, they are connected with sectaries of the *West* called *Publicani* : who, whether transported by the line of the Danube or across the sea,—whether in the movements of war, of commerce, or of direct missionary enterprize,—had already from the commencement of the 11th century (for God would thus first transplant his confessors, when the Turkish woe was to be let loose on Greek Christendom) appeared and excited notice in Italy and other countries of Western Europe :⁵

¹ Dowling, p. 48.—It is to be observed that, in the then state of the empire, their position on the Northern frontier at Philippopolis was one of peculiar trust and responsibility.—Compare the assignment of fortified towns to the *Hugonot* heretics, in a later age.

² Mr. Faber makes Cedrenus flourish in the 12th century : but Mr. Dowling, (p. 46,) infers from internal evidence, and I think with reason, that he died before the end of the xith.

³ The following passage occurs in Geoffroy de Ville Hardouin. “Une partie des genz qui estoient *Popolicani* s'en allerent à Johannise, et se rendirent à lui, et li distrent ; Sire, chenauche devant Phinepople ; enuoie tost : nos te rendrons la ville tote.” Dowling, p. 49.

⁴ From *popolis*, the terminating half of *Philippopolis*, *Popolicani* would be an adjective not unnaturally formed, as *Anglicani* from Anglia, &c. When hearing of the sect there residing as *Parlicani*, a word in sound not very dissimilar from *Poplicani*, the supposition seems to me warranted by the frequent and well-known Frankish corruptions of Greek names, that they may have confounded the two, and ascribed the former appellation to that of the city the Paulikians lived in. The *Philip* might be omitted by them in the process, just as the *Constantine* in the Turkish name (*Stambol*) of Constantinople.—The identity of the *Popolicani*, *Poplicani*, and *Publicani* with the *Paulikiani* is allowed on all hands. See Du Cange on the word.

⁵ “Under the Byzantine standard,” says Gibbon, (x. 186,) “the Paulikians

while in each of them acting on the same proselyting principles, and in each drawing down on themselves the same persecutions for heresy, as their brethren and predecessors in the East. Of these persecutions, says Gibbon, in his masterly and comprehensive sketch of the Paulikian sect, “the flames which consumed 12 Canons at Orleans (A. D. 1022) was the first act and signal.”¹

And so, at the precise epoch at which our sketch of the earlier *Western* Witnesses concluded, we are led by the fortunes of the *Eastern* Witnesses to the *West* again; and shall *there*, in our next Section, have to trace in the records of the two lines conjoined or intermixed, the further history of Christ’s Witnesses.

§ 4.—WITNESSES IN WESTERN EUROPE, WHETHER OF WESTERN OR EASTERN ORIGIN, DURING THE 11TH AND 12TH CENTURIES, UP TO THE RISE OF PETER VALDES.

In pursuing my subject in this Section I shall abstract the extant notices (and some, especially the first, very fully) of certain profest confessors for Christ, brought before the Councils of *Orleans*, *Arras*, *Thoulouse*, *Oxford*, and *Lombers*, in the years 1022,² 1025, 1119, 1160, 1165, respectively: filling up the long chronological interval between the *second* and *third*, in the want of recorded *details* of certain other intervening Councils, (at which however similar heretics seem similarly to have confest and been condemned,) by notices of *Berenger* and

were often transported to the Greek provinces of Italy and Sicily.” In a Note subjoined he quotes a curious extract, given by Muratori, from William the Apulian, thus noticing the Sectaries, and the odium of the Manichæan name attached to them, in his narrative of a battle between the Greeks and Normans A. D. 1040;

Cùm Græcis aderant quidam quos pessimus error
Fecerat *amentes*, et ab ipso nomen habebant.

The *amentes* is from *Μαῦρος* and *μεινομαι*. On the Italian settlement of the Paulikians, see Gibbon *ib.* and Mosheim xi. 2. 5. 2, with the Note. ¹ *Ibid.*

² A Charter of King Robert, given in the *Gallia Christiana*, Tom. viii. col. 491, which purports to have been executed in the year 1022, “quando Stephanus hæresiarches et complices ejus damnati sunt et arsi Aurelianus,” fixes the date of the transaction to *that* year, and not, as some report, 1017.

Peter de Bruys, with their respective followers; and that between the *third* and *fourth* by *Evervinus'* account of heretics, still evidently of the same line and character, that were condemned A. D. 1147 at *Cologne*.—In regard of *some* of these, the connexion in respect of local origin, as well as character, with the *Paulikians of the East* is marked decisively: in regard of *all* it is very possible:—though the greater probability seems to me this, that the Paulikian immigrants in the 11th and 12th centuries found, and partly intermingled with, other similar reputed heretics of native *western* growth; the offshoots of those dissentients, especially of Claudian origin, whom I traced in the previous Section.

Of the heretics condemned by the Council of ORLEANS we have four cotemporary, or nearly cotemporary reports, the fullest being that in the Chartulary of the Monastery of Chartres;¹—all however reports by *enemies*; and therefore, like those that I have already abstracted in

¹ Of *this* report Mr. Maitland says; “It is obviously a *biographical* account of *Arefastus*,”—the knight that was so prominent an actor in the transaction:—“in fact D’Achery (i. 604) tells us that it is extracted from the *Chartulary of St. Pierre en-Vallée* at *Chartres*; which is the very monastery in which *Arefastus* afterwards became a monk.” Letter to Dr. Mill, p. 19.—Of the *next* most full account, that by *Rodolphus Glaber*, he observes that its author was a monk of Dijon; whose Abbot was also Abbot of Fescampes in Normandy, having been invited to it by Count Richard of Normandy, the superior lord of *Arefaste*:—also that *Glaber's* History was written at the suggestion of this Abbot, and perhaps some twenty-five years after the Council of Orleans. *Ibid.* p. 30.—A *third* but briefer notice is found in *Ademar's* Chronicle of France,—a monk of *St. Martial*, living at the time of the Council, and whose Chronicle stops at the year 1029:—and a *fourth*, still briefer, in a Letter of *John*, a monk of *Fleury* near Orleans, addressed to the Bishop of *Vic* in Spain, and written in the same year, and probably within a few weeks of the transaction. For he speaks of it as having “happened at Orleans on *Innocent's* Day, without any other mark of time.” So Mr. Maitland infers, p. 32.—The original of three out of these four reports is printed both by Mr. Faber and Mr. Maitland; the other (*Ademar's*) only in its abridged form, as given by *Baronius*. As various points of interest are omitted in this abridgment, I shall here subjoin the full original, copied from *Harduin's* Councils, vi. 822; adding also, as it is very short, that of *John of Fleury*.

“Eo tempore,” inquit *Ademarus*, “decem ex Canonicis Sanctæ Crucis Aurelianis, qui videbantur esse religiosiores aliis, probati sunt esse Manichæi. Quos rex Robertus, cum nollent aliquatenus ad fidem reverti, primùm à gradu sacerdotii deponi, deinde ab ecclesiâ eliminari, et demum igne cremari jussit. Quidam etiam Aurelianensis canonicus cantor, nomine Theodatus, mortuus erat ante triennium in illâ hæresi, ut perhibebant viri religiosi et hæretici ipsi; cujus corpus, postquam probatum est, ejectum est de cœmeterio, jubente Episcopo Odalrico, et projectum in invium. Quia autem flammis judicati sunt supradicti decem cum *Lisoio*, quem rex valdè dilexerat propter sanctitatem quam eum ha-

my sketch of the sect in the *East*, to be received with the necessary allowance and caution.

It is said that the heresy, hitherto unknown in France, originated from a woman who had come from Italy,¹—the country where, as we have seen, Paulikian emigrant bands early gained footing in Western Europe ;²—and who, wherever she went, exercised so singular an influence, as to seduce not the more simple only and the laics to her opinions, but many even of the more learned of the priesthood.³ Thus at Orleans, as elsewhere, during a temporary sojourn in the city, she corrupted several of the clergy ; more especially two of the canons, named *Stephen* and *Lisoie*, who for their rank, learning, wisdom, alms-giving, and general sanctity of character, were, according to the united testimony of all four of the chroniclers,⁴ held universally in the highest reputation. These now became the local heads of the new heresy ; and with all their zeal endeavoured to propagate it both at Orleans and beyond it.—Among others the chaplain of a knight of Rouen (the latter named *Arefaste*) heard their fame, became their disciple, and returning home sought to proselyte his patron *Arefaste*, whom he loved, we are told, with singular affection ;⁵ assuring

bere credebat, securi nihil timebant : et à flammis se inlæsos exire promittebant ; et ridentes in medio ignis ligati sunt. Et sine morâ penitus in cinerem redacti sunt, ut nec de ossibus residuum inveniretur eorum.”

John of Fleury's account is as follows. “Volo vos intereâ scire de hæresi quæ die Sanctorum Innocentium fuit in Aurelianensi civitate. Nam verum fuit si aliquid audistis. Fecit Rex Robertus vivos ardere de melioribus clericis, sive de nobilioribus laicis, prope quatuordecim ejusdem civitatis ; qui Deo odibiles, perosique cælo et terræ, abnegando abnegabant sacri baptismi gratiam, Dominici quoque corporis et sanguinis consecrationem. Cum hoc, post perpetrata scelera vitiorum negabant posse recipi veniam peccatorum. Enimvero cùm his assertionibus nuptiis detrahebant :—à eibis etiam quos Deus creavit et adipe, tanquam ab immunditiis, abstinebant.”

¹ “Ex Italiâ procedente.” *Rod. Glaber.*

² See Note 3 p. 240.

³ “Seducebat quoscumque volebat, non solum idiotas et simplices, verum etiam plerosque qui videbantur doctiores in clericorum ordine.” *Rod. Glaber.*

⁴ So *Arefaste's Biographer* ; “Stephanus et Lisoius apud omnes sapientiâ clari, sanctitate magnifici, elemosynis largi, opinione habebantur vulgi :”—*John of Fleury* ; “quatuordecim de melioribus clericis sive de nobilioribus laicis ;”—*Ademar* ; “decem ex canonicis qui videbantur esse religiosiores aliis :” and again ; “Lisoio quem rex valdè dilexerat propter sanctitatem quam eum habere credebat :”—*Glaber* ; “hæresiarches duo (heu ! proh dolor !) qui in civitate putabantur genere ac scientiâ valentiores in clero ;” and again, “viro haectenus in omni morum probitate perutilissimos.”

⁵ “Quem singulari affectu diligebat.” *Arefaste's Biogr.*

him that Orleans shone above other cities with the light of wisdom, the lamp of holiness.¹—Arefaste suspected *heresy*; and, with the privity of the king and of some of the priesthood, went to Orleans, and feigned himself a disciple of the two canons, in order the better to detect it. In his case, just as in his chaplain's, the instructions of these new teachers began with, and were based on, the words of God's own book, the Bible.² As he listened and seemed impressed, they likened him, in figurative language still drawn from the Scriptures, to a wild tree transplanted from the wilderness of an evil world,³ and grafted on a better stock in their sanctuary; but added that he needed the cleansing and the pruning away of vices, in order to the reception of the doctrine that had been delivered to them by the Holy Spirit.⁴ And then they opened to him views strange and heretical on the religious tenets in vogue throughout Christendom; saying, that in *baptism* there was no washing away of sins, in the *sacramental elements* no conversion by the priest's consecrating words into Christ's body and blood;⁵ that it was vanity to make prayers to the *saints* and *martyrs*; that *works of piety and justice*, esteemed in the Church Catholic to be the purchase-price of an eternal reward,⁶ were superfluous:—further, according to

¹ "Præ cæteris urbibus coruscare luce sapientiæ, atque sanctitatis lampade." To those who with me may feel convinced that these Orleanists were real Christian witnesses, the figure used in the above will suggest the Apocalyptic symbol, "These are the two candlesticks."

² Of the Chaplain it is said, "cùm divini verbi dulcedine ab eis debriatur;" of Arefaste, "Cùm primum divinorum voluminum exemplis eum informarent."—It will be well to mark the words "divinorum voluminum." They could scarcely have been used had the New Testament been the *only* part of God's word appealed to. ³ "Translatus de iniquo sæculo." Ibid.

⁴ The reference is evidently to John xv. 2, 3; "Every branch that beareth fruit he cleanseth it, (καθαριεῖ) that it may bring forth more fruit. . . . Now ye are clean (καθαροὶ) through the word that I have spoken to you." They applied the figure as including both the *cleansing* of the plant with water, and *amputating* with the husbandman's knife: "aquis perfunderis sapientiæ;"—"donec gladio verbi Dei vitiorum spinis carere valeas."

⁵ So in the *Chartulary*.—By *John of Fleury* the same charges are thus expressed; "abnegando abnegabant sacri baptismi gratiam, dominici quoque corporis et sanguinis consecrationem."—In regard of *John of Fleury's* further charges against them of *disparaging marriage*, and *abstaining from meats*, I have omitted noticing them in the text, because none of the other accounts specify them.

⁶ "Omne Christianorum opus, pietatis duntaxat et justitiæ, quod æstimatur pretium remunerationis æternæ, laborem superfluum judicabant esse." *Glaber*.

Rodolphus Glaber, that the heaven and earth, as now visible, had existed from eternity,¹—that all the Bible said of a Trinity of Godhead in Unity was false,—and, according to the Chartulary, that Christ was neither born of the Virgin Mary, nor had suffered for men, nor had been really buried in the tomb, nor had risen from the dead.—Now, whatever the knight may have thought or felt respecting *Christ*, it is notorious that, according to the received theology of the day, it was on the saints and the sacraments, the works of merit and the penances,² thus alike set aside by his teachers, that he must have rested his hopes of salvation. “If not to these,” he said, “tell me what I may look to, lest I despair.” In answer, while congratulated on his eyes having begun to open to the true faith, he was told that in their further instructions they would shew him the way wherein he would be cleansed from every spot of sin, and taught by the Holy Spirit unreservedly that doctrine which was the mystery and the glory of all Scripture:³ after which he would have heavenly food wherewith to satiate his soul; would see angelic visions; and in the abiding fellowship of the Lord of all, in whom were all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, never know want again.⁴

I pass over the story that follows in the Chartulary (professedly in explanation of what was meant by the promised *heavenly food*) of a nightly meeting, an invo-

¹ “Cælum pariter ac terram, ut conspiciuntur, absque auctore initii semper extitisse asserabant.” *Ib.*

² I add the word *penances*, in allusion to John of Fleury’s statement respecting the impossibility of pardon after flagrant sins committed (see p. 242): supposing the impotence of *penance* to that effect to be the thing intended; and thus the charge to be of the same nature with Rodolphus Glaber’s respecting works of merit.

³ “Pandemus tibi salutis ostium, quo ingressus (per impositionem videlicet manuum nostrarum) ab omni peccati labe mundaberis, atque sancti Spiritûs dono repleberis; qui Scripturarum omnium profunditatem et veram dignitatem absque scrupulo te docebit.” *Chartulary.*

⁴ “Deinde cælesti cibo pastus, internâ satietate recreatus, videbis persæpe non obsecum visiones angelicas . . . nihilque tibi deerit, quia Deus omnium tibi comes nunquam deerit, in quo sapientiæ thesauri atque divitiarum consistunt.” *Ib.*—The reader will observe that I have deviated in the text from this original by saying, “treasures of wisdom and *knowledge*,” instead of “wisdom and *riches*;” doing so because it seems to me plain that it was a quotation from Col. ii. 3.

cation and apparition of the Devil, followed by horrid impurities, atrocities, and Thyestean banquets, very much such as were ascribed to the early Christians by their heathen enemies.¹ Its absurdity and manifest falsehood, as Mosheim says,² forbids it a moment's attention; except as shewing the animus of the writer, and of others that have written like him. If true in a single particular, would it not have been reported by Arefaste against his teachers at the Council?³ It is evidently a mere traditionary legend patched, on the original narrative of Arefaste by its monkish retailer; and with the motive, as indeed he tells us, to scare true Christian men from the horrid heresy.⁴—The proper narrative proceeds to tell of the assembling of a Council against the heretics. It was under the presidency of King Robert and the Bishops of the neighbourhood; and Arefaste and the two Canons were summoned before it. At first, on their rendering a confession of their faith, it seemed difficult to convict them of heresy.⁵ But when charged by Arefaste with having taught him, as gospel,⁶ the several anti-sacramental and antichristian errors above specified, and reminded also of their assurance to him, that from that doctrine neither tortures nor death should ever make them swerve, they confessed to the charge, and said they had long held the doctrine:⁷ nor could either the arguments of the Council, enforced for some hours,⁸ or the threats of a

⁵ See in Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Minutius Felix, &c. Of this resemblance more afterwards.

² "Planè falsum." xi. 2. 5. 3.

³ I might say moreover,—had such been their habits, would Arefaste have received the report he did from his Chaplain?—Further contrast their acknowledged excellence of moral character;—and again their exprest sentiment as reported by John of Fleury, *Post perpetrata scelera*, &c. See p. 242.

⁴ "*Digressionem fecisse videor, ut Christicolæ caveant se ab hoc nefario opere.*"

⁵ So the Chartulary.

⁶ "*Illam doctrinam quam salutiferam evangelizabatis.*" Ibid. The word *gospel*, is one that the Paulikians were ever fond of. So in Sergius' Letter. So too Bernard of the Petrobrussians; "*Solius evangelii se profitentur æmulatores, et solos;*" &c. Quoted by Faber, p. 189.

⁷ Glaber.

⁸ The Biographer of Arefaste, in the Chartulary, makes the question of Christ's birth, suffering, and resurrection in human nature the chief subject of the President's arguments with the accused. "We were not present," they said, "and so cannot believe it true." To which the President; "Do you not believe that you had carnal parents?" And, on their assenting, "If then ye believe that ye were procreated from parents when ye were not, why disbelieve that God was begotten from God without mother before the worlds, and afterwards born of a

torturing death, induce recantation ; either from themselves or others, who now, to the number of ten or twelve, chiefly clergy, eagerly pressed forward to declare their accordance of faith with them.¹ With strange confidence they asserted their assured expectation that both those around them, and all the world, would sooner or later acknowledge their doctrine to be the truth ;² and, as to the burning threatened, made light of it, even as if persuaded that they would come out of it unhurt.³—Their final answer to the Council is said to have been as follows : and there is a freshness, life, and character in the words that almost of itself evidences to us their correctness ; just as if too deeply engraven on the mind of Arefaste, who must himself have reported them, ever to be forgotten : “ *Ye may say these things to those whose taste is earthly, and who believe the figments of men written on parchment. But to us who have the law written on the inner man by the Holy Spirit, and savour nothing but what we have learnt from God, the Creator of all, ye speak things vain and unworthy of the Deity. Put therefore an end to your words ! Do with us even as you wish ! Even now we see our King reigning in the heavenly places ; who with his right hand is conduct-*

Virgin through the Holy Spirit’s overshadowing ?” They replied, “ What nature denies always differs from creation.” To which the President ; “ Before any thing was made by nature, believe ye not that God the Father made all things by His Son out of nothing ?” After which their reply is given ; “ *Ye may relate,*” &c,—the memorable reply-cited below.—On this Mr. Maitland says ; “ Their examination was chiefly on one point, the denial of the great mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh :” and he blames Mr. Faber for not so reporting it. But surely it is Mr. Maitland, not Mr. Faber, that is wrong in the matter. The final answer of the accused is evidence in itself that it was not to such a dialogue or argument as that we have just quoted that it was the answer ; but rather to some carnal formal system of religion and human invention, opposed by their judges to one spiritual, and delivered to men by the Holy Spirit. Indeed it seems to me to bear internal evidence, from its stupidity, incongruousness of texture, and want of keeping with of the general narrative, of having been foisted on Arefaste’s own narration by his monkish Biographer ; just as in the case of the legend of Satan’s apparition, &c. noticed before.

¹ The Chartulary says that the whole number of heretics were summoned to the Council at once ; “ *omnis illa nequissima congregatio.*” Glaber says that in the Council, on Stephen and Lisoie making their confession of faith, “ *plures post illos se parti illorum profitebantur hærerè, nec ullâ ratione se posse affirmabant ab illorum segregare consortio.*” He states the number burnt at 13 ; of whom Ademur makes 10 to have been Clerics and Canons.

² “ *Tam vos quàm cæteros, cujuscumque legis vel ordinis, in eam cadere expectavimus ; quod etiam adhuc fore credimus.*” Glaber.

³ *Ibid.*

ing us to immortal triumphs and heavenly joys.”¹—On this, after shameless insults and acts of violence, received both from the people and specially the Queen who was present,² they were despoiled of their clerical vestments, and led to a great fire kindled without the city. Even then their confidence did not forsake them. They smiled, it is said, when tied to the stake, and in the midst of the flames.³—The monk Ademar takes pleasure in relating that the fire (as if in mockery of their hopes) quickly and effectually did its office. The number burnt is stated at from 12 to 14 ; two only, out of the whole number, having recanted. At the same time the corpse of another Canon, who, it was learnt, had died in the heresy three years before, was at the command of the Bishop of Orleans exhumed from its sepulchre, and cast in token of indignity by the highway.⁴

Of the heretics examined at the Council of ARRAS the account is as follows.⁵—It was reported to the Bishop, when holding a station there in the year 1025, that certain men had lately come into the neighbourhood from the confines of Italy,⁶ and introduced a new heresy: setting forth a certain kind of righteousness,—so they called it,—as that by which alone men were purified ;

¹ I must give the original unbroken. “Ista illis narrare potes qui terrena sapiunt, atque credunt figmenta carnalium hominum scripta in membranis animalium. Nobis autem qui legem scriptam habemus in interiori homine à Spiritu Sancto, et nihil aliud sapimus nisi quod à Deo omnium Conditore didicimus, incassum superflua et divinitate devia profers. Idcirco verbis finem impone, et de nobis quidquid velis facito. Jam Regem nostrum in cælestibus regnantem videmus ; qui ad immortales triumphos dexterâ suâ nos sublevat, dans superna gaudia.” *Chartulary*.—A contrast seems intended in the appropriating pronoun *Regem nostrum*, between the earthly king condemning and the heavenly approving.

² The writer in the *Chartulary* relates, and evidently with satisfaction ; “When they had been ejected from the Church, the Queen, (like Herodias, says Faber,) with a stick which she was carrying, *struck out the eye* of Stephen, formerly her Confessor !”

³ See Ademar's account.

⁴ Ademar.—In A. D. 1029 we read that there was a gathering of the neighbouring Bishops with King Robert, to the dedication of St. Anne's Church at Orleans, on which occasion her relics, and those other *saints*, were exhumed with honor.

⁵ See for the full account of this Council *D'Achery's Spicilegium*, i. 607 ; for a summary Faber's Extracts from it, given in his Book p. 358, or Mosheim's briefer notice, xi. 2. 5. 4.

⁶ “Ab Italia finibus viros eo loci advenisse ;” “auditores Gundulfi cujusdam ab Italia partibus.”

and asserting that there was no sacrament of the church, by which otherwise they could attain to salvation ;¹—thus overthrowing the established religion. The chief teachers of the sect being, it would seem, absent, the other and more illiterate members of it were summoned before the Bishop, and asked of their doctrine, worship, rule of life, and chief teacher. They replied that they were the hearers of one Gandulph, from the parts of Italy ; that they had been instructed by him in the precepts of the Gospels and Apostles ; that they received no scriptures but these, and held to them in word and life. When questioned respecting the established religion, it appeared that they disbelieved in the sacred mystery of baptism, the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, the efficacy of penances in satisfaction for sin, the doctrine of purgatory, and use of masses for the dead ; that they disapproved of the adoration of relics, images, and the cross, of saint-worship, of the altars, incense, bell-tinkling, and chanting in the church-worship, of marriage² also and burial in the church, as prescribed by the ritual ; that they denied the legitimacy even of the priesthood, and, in short, the whole doctrine and discipline of the Romish Church. As regarded themselves and their rule of life, they said, (and no one seems to have impeached their conduct as inconsistent with the profession,) “ If any one will diligently examine, it will be found agreeable with the doctrine of the Gospels and Apostles. It is to separate from the world ; to restrain the flesh from concupiscence ; to gain our livelihood by the works of our hands ; to injure none ; and to shew love to all who unite in desiring to follow the same doctrine and life.”³—The result of the examination of these

¹ “Quandam justitiam præferentes hâc solâ purificari homines asserebant, nullumque in sanctâ Ecclesiâ aliud esse sacramentum, per quod ad salutem pervenire potuissent.” D'Achery *ibid.*

² “Legitima connubia execrari.” *Ibid.*

³ “Lex et disciplina nostra, quam à magistro accepimus, nec evangelicis decretis, nec apostolicis sanctionibus contraire videbitur, si quis eam diligenter velit intueri. Hæc namque hujusmodi est : mundum relinquere ; carnem à concupiscentiis frænare ; de laboribus manuum suarum victum parare ; nulli læsionem quærere, caritatem emctis quos zelus hujus propositi teneat exhibere.” Dacher. i. 608..

simple and illiterate men is said to have been their return to the Catholic Church, through the persuasions of the Bishop: whose arguments, let it be observed, were based on the Holy Scriptures, as what was received by them,¹ *the Old Testament* as well as the New. Thus, even supposing them right in their faith, they failed of being witnesses for Christ. However, the sketch given will assist us the better to understand the nature of the heresy that had been taught them, more especially in respect of that doctrine of a certain *justifying righteousness*,² opposed to that which was generally taught to *flow from the sacraments*. Though *they* abandoned it, (at least on that occasion,) we have abundant evidence to shew the steadfastness of others; and their real witnessing, in defence of the same doctrine, in many different parts of France.

I pass over the notices of heretics condemned at the Council of CHARROUX, in 1028,³ and others in the Council of RHEIMS, A. D. 1049,⁴ with the mere remark, in the want of recorded details, that they seem to have been heretics of the same class and character as those already noticed at Orleans and at Arras. The link that next demands more direct notice in our chain of evi-

¹ "In hoc vobis repugnare convincimini, quòd evangelica vos et apostolica præcepta" (p. 611, "fidem evangelicam et traditionem apostolicam") tenere dicitis." Dacher. p. 609. And then the Bishop argues from the New Testament and Old Testament indiscriminately.

² The Bishop, in his address, argues as if this was a righteousness of mere *human merit*. But *faith* was expressly spoken of by the men in question as essential to the righteousness they advocated. For their objection to the baptismal rite was this,—that *personal* faith in the baptized did not accompany it.

³ This Council is thus noticed by Ademar in his Chronicle. "His diebus (A. D. 1028) Concilium aggregavit Episcoporum et Abbatum Dux Wilhelmus," (i. e. William the 4th Duke of Aquitaine,) "apud Karrofum, propter extinguentes hæreses quæ vulgo à *Manichæis* disseminabantur." Harduin vi. 843.

⁴ After the 12th Canon we find in the Acts of the Council, the clause following: "Et quia *novi hæretici* in Gallicanis partibus emerant, eos excommunicavit; illis additis qui ab eis aliquid munus vel servitium acciperent, aut quodlibet defensionis patrocinium illis impenderent." Harduin vi. 1007.—It is probable that allusion was made to heretics of the same class in the 13th Canon of the Council of *Thoulouse*, held A. D. 1056; the charge there given being in tenor not dissimilar from the former. "Cum *hæreticis* et cum *excommunicatis* ullam participationem vel societatem habentem præcipuè excommunicamus; nisi correctionis vel admonitionis causâ, ut ad fidem redeant catholicam. Si qui autem adjuvantes eos defendere conati fuerint, vinculo simul excommunicationis cum eis subditi permaneant." Hard. vi. 1046. So were all suspected of heresy interdicted and cut off from society!

dence, is the history of the notable heresy and sect of BERENGER.

It was in the year 1045, being then principal of the public school at Tours, (he was afterwards Archdeacon of Angers,) that he first excited attention, by combating the received doctrine of transubstantiation. We are not told who was his instructor in the doctrine; and his appeals to Scripture, as much as to the early Fathers,¹ shew that his faith rested on his own examination of it. At the same time it seems not improbable, that an incidental intimation which we find in history of his having in the fervency of his *earlier years* disgraced himself by the defence of certain heresies,² may have had reference to some early partiality betrayed by him for the heretics and heresies, then so rife through the French provinces, of which we have been speaking.—“Roman Catholic writers,” says Dean Waddington,³ “do not dispute the brilliancy of his talents, his eloquence, or general erudition. They admit too that habits of exemplary piety gave life and efficacy to his genius and learning: by which merits he acquired the veneration of the people, and the friendship of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of the day.”⁴—His doctrine was condemned in Councils held at Rome, Vercelli, and Paris, in the year 1050: and he was in consequence deprived of the temporalities of his benefice. Still, however, professing and promulgating his doctrine, he was summoned in 1055 to

¹ Thus in a Letter to his adversary Lanfranc, he says, “Nondum enim adeo sategisti in Scripturâ divinâ;” i. e. in condemning his doctrine. Of the Fathers he says that Ambrose, Jerom, and Augustine must be esteemed heretics, if he was one. Hard. ib. Col. 1016.

² “Licet Berengarius primum calorem juventutis aliquantarum hæresium defensione infamaverit.” William of Malmesbury, quoted by Faber, p. 158. In which passage we are to observe that there is the ascription to him of *heresies* in the *plural*, not of *one* heresy only; also that the ascription has reference to his early youth. Now his main heretical doctrine, (as it was deemed) that of *anti-transubstantiation*, he preached and propagated, notwithstanding his retractions, through life. ³ p. 293.

⁴ Compare William of Malmesbury’s testimony to his character. “Innumeris bonis, maximèque humilitate et elemosynis, approbatus. Largarum possessionum dispertiendo dominus; non abscondendo et adorando famulus. Fœminæ venustatis adeo pareus ut nullam conspectui suo pateretur admitti, nè formam videretur delibasse oculo quam non pruriebat animo. Non aspernari pauperem; non adulari divitem. Secundùm naturam vivere: habens victum et vestitum, juxtà Apostolum his contentus esse.” Apud Faber 158.

another Council at Tours; at the which the famous Hildebrand attended as Papal Legate, and at which Berenger seems to have retracted. The retractation, in terms more or less dubious, was repeated a second and a third time, in the course of the 30 years following. Berenger, though he might hold the doctrine, had not the fortitude of a martyr. His retractation, however, was not from conviction, but under the influence of fear. In every case he reasserted the same doctrine after quitting the Council; employed poor scholars to disseminate it through France; and died, we are told, A. D. 1088, a penitent and in sorrow,—not, we know, on account of his anti-Romish doctrine, but on account of his retractation.¹—His views on the *sacrament* were very much those of the English Church; viz. that Christ's body is *spiritually* present to the *inner man*, and *spiritually* eaten by those, and those only, who are the true members of Christ.² In short it was the doctrine of what was spiritual against the then received *ex opere operato* doctrine of necessary and universal efficacy in the sacrament, as well as against its constituting an expiatory sacrifice.—With views like these on the *one* sacrament, it is scarce to be supposed but that Berenger, like his Paulikian cotemporaries, would hold views similarly heretical respecting the *other*. And indeed we have direct testimony to the fact. A letter is extant, of the date 1048, from the then Bishop of Liege to King Henry; invoking his interposition against Berenger and his friend Bruno, Bishop of Angers, as not only promulgating the heresy of *anti-transubstantiation*, (I use the term anticipatively,) but also (much like those at *Arras* and *Orleans*) doing away, it was said, with the *baptism of infants*

¹ Mosheim (xi. 2. 3. 17) refers to a little work of Berenger's, in which he declares that he had retracted under fear of death, and prays God's forgiveness for it. "Deus Omnipotens," he says, "miserere, fons misericordiarum, tantum sacrilegium agnoscenti." Note 9.

² Mosheim (ib. 18, Note 3) cites the following from a Letter of Berenger's, as decisive of his views: "Constat verum Christi corpus in ipsâ mensâ proponi, sed *spiritualiter interiori* homini verum; in eâ Christi corpus *ab his duntaxat qui Christi membra sunt*, incorruptum, intaminatum, inatritumque *spiritualiter* manducari."

and *legitimate marriage*.¹—A yet further connecting link with the Paulikian sectaries, or else with some other similar line, appears in a remarkable statement ascribed to Berenger by his adversary the famous Lanfranc: “The gospel was preached in all nations: the world believed: the Church was formed. It increased: it fructified: but, through the unskilfulness of those who understood not, fell away into error afterwards, and perished. *In us alone, and those who follow us, has the holy Church survived on earth.*”² Now it is not to be supposed that Berenger meant the *perishing* here spoken of, in other words the *apostacy* of the Church, to have occurred only recently, and in his own time. And if not, his declaration of its having remained in those who thought with him, becomes his testimony to a *line* or *succession* of faithful dissentients from the established Church *before him*; whether the *Paulikians*, as I said, or *some other line*.—It well consists, too, with the sentiment elsewhere ascribed to him respecting the Church of Rome; to the purport, “that the Romish Church was a Church of malignants, and its See not the Apostolic seat, but that of Satan;”³—and is indeed altogether *most remarkable*.

¹ “Fama omnium nostrum replevit aures, qualiter Bruno Andegavensis episcopus, item Berengarius Turonensis, *antiquas hæreses* modernis temporibus introducendo, adstruant corpus Domini non tam corpus esse quam umbram et figuram corporis Domini; *legitima connubia destruant*; et, quantum in ipsis est, *baptismum parvulorum evertant.*” Harduin, vi. 1023. (The extract, which seems to me curious and interesting, had not, I thought, been noticed before: but I now find it to have been referred to in Dr. Gilly’s Waldensian Researches, p. 89.) The asserted *antiquity of the heresies* deserves notice; as well as the ascription to Berenger, not of *one*, but *all*.—Bossuet (Variations xi. i. 1.) says; “Berengarius impugned nothing but the real Presence.” This is only one, out of many examples, of Bossuet’s inaccuracies.

² “Prædicatum est evangelium in omnibus gentibus: credidit mundus: facta est ecclesia. Crevit: fructificavit: sed, imperitiâ malè intelligentium, postea erravit et periit. In nobis solis, et in his qui nos sequuntur, sancta in terris ecclesia remansit.” De Corp. et Sang. Cap. 23; apud B. P. M. xviii. 776.

³ So Lanfranc, B. P. M. xviii. p. 770;—also in the Tract by an anonymous Benedictine monk; who, after noticing Berenger’s abjuration before Pope Nicholas, thus adds; “Sed Berengarius more suo ad proprium vomitum redire non timuit; et, *ultrâ omnes hæreticos*, Romanos Pontifices et sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam verbis et scriptis blasphemare præsumpsit. Nempe sanctum Leonem Papam, non Pontificem, sed pompificem et pulpificem appellavit; sanctam Romanam ecclesiam vanitatis concilium et ecclesiam malignantium; Romanam sedem non apostolicam, sed sedem Satanæ, dictis et scriptis non timuit appellare. Harduin, vi. col. 1014. The assertion is indeed remarkable, as the monk says,

I may mention, in passing, a notice that occurs in the History of Aquitaine, of heretics of the same character as those at Orleans, being discovered at Perigord: also in the History of the Treves Diocese of heretics found at Ivo within it, A. D. 1101; who, in agreement with those above mentioned, denied the *transubstantiation* of the elements in the one sacrament, and the availment to the salvation of *infants* of the other sacrament, i. e. of *baptism*; besides many other errors, it is said, unspecified.¹ I must not however dwell on this, but proceed to the history and the heresy of *Peter de Bruys*.

The account of PETER DE BRUYS is derived chiefly from a letter written against him by the cotemporary abbot of Clugny. It seems that he was originally a presbyter of the Church; then became a missionary and protester against what he denounced as the superstitions of the day, in the French provinces of Dauphiny, Provence, and Languedoc;—the former the subsequent scene of the labours of the sainted Neff.² His success was great; and a sect formed of his followers. They were vulgarly called after him *Petrobrussians*; but called themselves *Apostolicals*,³—very much like the *Paulikians* named after *St. Paul*,—as being men that professed to

for going beyond those of all heretics thus far. A century after, the Waldenses, as a body, made it.

“To know from what source Berengarius derived this language,” says Bishop Hurd, “we need only reflect that in the catalogue of his works we find a Treatise written by him expressly on the *Book of Revelations*.” Hurd on the Papal Anti-christ.

¹ “Ivodii, quod Trevericæ diœcesis appenditium est, fuerunt eo tempore (A. D. 1101.) hæretici, qui substantiam panis et vini, quæ in altari per sacerdotes benedicitur, in corpus Christi et sanguinem veraciter transmutari negabant: nec baptismi sacramentum parvulis ad salvationem proficere dicebant; et alia perplura erronea, quæ memoriæ tradere nefas duxi.” *Histor. Trev. in Dacher. Spicil. ii. 221.* Given originally by Faber, p. 359.

² Peter de Clugny’s Treatise against the Petrobrussians is addressed to the Bishops of *Embrun*, *Die*, and *Gap*, as the countries where the heresy first spread, and remained still lurking. “Putabam Alpes gelidas, et perpetuis nivibus operatos scopulos, incolis vestris barbariem invexisse; itaque agrestibus et indoctis hominum moribus peregrinum dogma faciliùs irrepsisse.” *B. P. M. xxii. p. 1035.*

Peter de Bruys is placed in the line of *Paulikian* origin by the ancient Languedoc historian, Bossuet, Mr. Faber, and others. Perhaps a *Western Alpine* origin should rather have been assigned him, as by the Waldensian, Peyran, and others.

³ “Jaetant se esse successores Apostolorum, et *Apostolicos* nominant.” Bernard super Cantic. Serm. 66, ap. Faber, 196.

follow the apostolic doctrine. At length in the year 1126, after near twenty years of missionary labour, he was seized by his enemies, and burnt to death, in the town of St. Giles, near Thoulouse ; so passing, says the abbot, from temporal to eternal fire.

The account of the Petrobrussian heresies, given by Peter de Clugny, is as follows : 1st, that Christian *baptism* is of no benefit without faith accompanying,—and *that* not the faith of *others*, but of the *baptized one* : a view grounded by them on Christ's words, “ Whosoever *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved,” so doing away, says the abbot, with infant baptism ; and which he elsewhere notices as thus expressed by the Petrobrussian heretics, “ Neither baptism is of avail without personal faith, nor personal faith without baptism : ” ¹ 2nd, that Christ's body and blood are not present in the *sacrament of the altar*, nor ought indeed to be offered to God, as for the salvation of the souls of the people ; seeing that his body was once for all given to his disciples at the last supper, and has since then been never *made by* any one, nor *given to* any one : ² 3rd, that it is vain to sacrifice, pray, give alms, or do other good deeds in behalf of the *dead* ; the latter being wholly unaffected thereby, and *purgatory* a mere invention : ³ 4th, that the *cross* is not to be adored or honoured ; rather that, as representing the instrument on which Christ was cruelly tortured and killed,⁴ it should be marked with

¹ “ Primum hæreticorum capitulum negat parvulos, infra intelligibilem ætatem constitutos, Christi baptisate posse salvari ; nec alienam fidem posse illis prodesse qui suâ uti non possunt : quoniam, juxta eos, non aliena fides, sed propria, cum baptisate salvat : Domino dicente, “ Qui crediderit,” &c.—Petr. Cluniac. contra Petrobrus. apud Bibl. P. Max. xxii. 1034. Again ; “ Dixistis, Nec baptismus sine propriâ fide, nec propria fides sine baptismo, aliquid potuit. Neutrum enim sine altero salvat.” Ib. p. 1045.

² “ Non solum veritatem corporis et sanguinis Domini quotidie et continue per sacramentum in ecclesiâ oblatum negat ; sed omnino illud nihil esse, neque Deo offerri debere.” Ib. 1034. Again ; “ Non tantum veritatem carnis et sanguinis Christi, sed et sacramentum, speciem, ac figuram negatis ; et sic absque summi et veri Dei sacrificio ejus populum esse censetis.” And ; “ Corpus Christi (dicitis) semel tantum ab ipso Christo in cœnâ ante passionem factum est, et semel, hoc est tunc tantum, discipulis datum est. Exinde neque confectum ab aliquo, neque alicui datum est.” Ib. 1057.—This comes fourth in the Abbot's list of charges. I have placed it next to the other sacramental charge.

³ So Bernard apud Faber, p. 195.

⁴ “ Instrumentum quo Christus tam dirè tortus, tam crudeliter occisus est.”

hatred, and cut up, or burnt: 5th, that the building of *churches* is unnecessary; since God's Church consists not of a multitude of cemented stones, but of the unity of the faithful gathered together; and prayer is equally heard by him every where: 6th, that God is mocked by the Priest's *chanting* in public worship; seeing that He is not pleased with musical sounds, but with the affections of the heart.—Besides these charges he notices that which we have seen urged against the Eastern Paulikians, of *rejecting* the *Old Testament*: acknowledging however that he had only heard it rumoured, and that it might not be true. Again, by St. Bernard the further charges were soon after added of *condemning marriage* and *meats*: and Bossuet in later times, insisting on the truth of these, as well as of the charges before enumerated, has branded Peter de Bruys and his disciples as undoubted *Manicheans*.—It may be well therefore, the evidence being close at hand, to anticipate in respect of *this* branch of the sectaries, the intended examination of the charges against the general Paulikian body; and to observe that two *facts* are incidently noticed by the Abbot of Clugny which constitute a direct contradiction to Bernard's accusations: the *one* that Peter de Bruys and his disciples, in order to mark their contempt of the crosses and cross-worship, had impiously on a certain Good Friday broken a wooden cross to pieces, kindled a fire with them, *roasted flesh* thereon, and *eaten* it, after a public invitation to the people to partake; ¹—the other that they had actually compelled certain monks to *marry wives*; ²—the reason, as given by Coccius, being that they considered that priests and monks should rather marry than live in fornication. Besides which it is to be observed that the Petrobrussian doctrine that the *cross* should be hated as the *instrument*

¹ “Ad inauditam Divinitatis contumeliam, magno de crucibus aggere instructo, ignem immisistis, pyram fecistis, *carnes coristis*, et ipso passionis Dominicæ die, invitatis publicè ad talem esum populis, comedistis.” And again; “Die ipso passionis Dominicæ publicè carnes comestæ.” Petr. Clun. pp. 1051, 1035.

² “Monachi ad ducendas uxores terroribus sunt ac tormentis compulsi.” Petr. Clun. ib. 1035. Faber, p. 210, cites Coccius' comment; “Sacerdotes et monachos potius debere uxores ducere quàm scortari.”

of *Christ's torture and cruel death*, is a direct refutation of the charge of *docetic Manicheism*; ¹ the which, as is well known, represented Christ to have been a mere *phantasm*, and not of flesh and blood susceptible of suffering and death like our own.

The heresies of Peter de Bruys were propagated after his death by one named HENRY; an *Italian* by birth, and whom the Abbot of Clugny and others speak of as a disciple of Peter.² Beginning from *Lausanne* he soon transferred his labors to *Provence* and *Languedoc*; with eloquence such as to melt all hearts, and a character for both sanctity and benevolence such as to win all admiration.³ He was the *Whitfield* of the age and country. And his success was so great that, when St. Bernard was called in to stem it, a change appeared in the very habits and manners of the people such as is thus graphically described by him. "The churches are without people; the people without priests; the priests without reverence; Christians without Christ:⁴ the churches reckoned but as synagogues; the sacraments not held sacred; pilgrimages, saints-invocation, oblations for the dead, and festival-days neglected: by denial of the grace of baptism infants precluded from salvation; and men dying in their sins,—their souls hurried away to the terrible tribunal without penitence or communion."⁵—The eloquence of Bernard was successful in restoring the ascendancy of the established faith. Henry was pursued to Thoulouse, and then to Rheims: where in the year

¹ Mr. Faber has well urged this argument. It applies also, as I shall show, to the *Eastern* and *earlier Paulikians*.

² Mosheim doubts the connexion, chiefly because of Peter de Bruys' breaking crosses, and Henry's carrying about the banner of a cross with him. But the reason seems, as Dean Waddington observes, insufficient. Peter de Clugny says; "Henrico ejus pseud-apostolo." B. P. M. 1036.

³ Mabillon in his *Vet. Analecta* gives the following testimony of an eye-witness to *Henry's* character and behaviour in Provence. "Publicè testabatur nunquam se virum attractasse tantæ rigiditatis, tantæ humanitatis et fortitudinis: cujus affatu cor etiam lapideum facile ad compunctionem posset provocari. Dum orationem haberet ad populum, eisdem clericis ad pedes ejus residentibus et flentibus, tali resonabat oraculo, ac si dæmonum legiones uno hiatu ejus ore murmur exprimerent. Veruntamen mirum in modum facundus erat." Mustou, p. 246.

⁴ i. e. Christ as formed by *transubstantiation* from the sacramental elements.

⁵ See his Ep. 241, to Count Ildefonso of St. Giles, near Thoulouse; and Gaudridus' *Life of Bernard*, iii. 6.

1147 he was seized, convicted, and imprisoned ; and soon after died ; whether by a natural death, or by the flames, (as *Arnold of Brescia*, soon after,¹) is a point disputed.²

But I must hasten on to speak of the heretics discovered and burnt at COLOGNE in that same year 1147. We have an account of them in a letter addressed to St. Bernard from *Evervinus*, Præpositus of *Steinfeld* near that city.³—He says that they were brought up before an assembly of the clergy and laity ; including many nobles, and presided over by the Archbishop himself. The inferior and more illiterate members of the sect had declared that, if their teachers failed to make good the cause, they would return to the Catholic Church : although otherwise resolved rather to die than do it. Accordingly, on the gathering of the assembly, two of these teachers maintained their heresy from the words of Christ and his Apostles : and in so far successfully, that though some returned, yet others, (the greater number apparently,) continued firm in their heresy. On this, after three days admonition, they were seized by the people, put into the fire, and burnt. “And what is most wonderful,” adds *Evervinus*, “they entered to the stake, and bare the torment of the fire, not only with patience, but with joy and gladness.—Holy Father ! I wish your explanation, how these members of the Devil could with such courage and constancy persist in their heresy, as is scarcely to be found in the most religious of the faith of Christ.”⁴

In describing the heresies of these men he distinguishes two divisions or varieties of the sect, then and there existing.—It is, I believe, the earliest direct notice of such division ; and both on this and other accounts deserves careful attention.

¹ Omitted in my list above, as having mixed up too much the *political* with the *religious* reformer. He was condemned by the Lateran Council A. D. 1139, and burnt at Rome 1155.

² Faber, 185, &c.

³ See Mr. Maitland's *Facts and Documents*, p. 344, &c ; where *Allix's* translation is given, with a few notes of his own. I regret that he has not, as usual, given the original Latin from *Mabillon* in the Appendix.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 345.

Of the *first* he says: "They assert that the Church is only among them,' because they alone follow the steps of Christ and his Apostles; not seeking the things of this world, or accumulating its possessions, like the Romanists. 'We are,' they say, 'the poor of Christ; who have no certain abode, fleeing from one city to another, like sheep in the midst of wolves, and enduring persecution, in common with the Apostles and Martyrs: and this notwithstanding that we lead an holy and strict life in fasting and abstinence, persevering day and night in prayers and labors, and seeking from thence, as those who are not of this world, only what is necessary to support life. As for you, loving the world, ye have peace with the world, because ye are of the world. False apostles, who adulterate the word of Christ, seeking their own have misled you and your forefathers: whereas we and our fathers, *being born apostles*, have continued in the grace of Christ, and shall continue so to the end of the world. To distinguish between us and you Christ saith, By their fruits ye shall know them. Our fruits are the footsteps of Christ."—As regards the *sacraments*, it was confessed openly by them both that daily at their tables, when they take their meals, they, according to the form of Christ and his Apostles, consecrate their meat and drink into the body and blood of Christ by the Lord's Prayer, therewith to nourish themselves, as being the *members and body of Christ*: also that, *besides water-baptism*, they *baptized*, (and had been themselves so baptized,) with fire and the Holy Ghost; according to John the Baptist's words, 'He (Christ) shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.'—Respecting us their saying is, that we hold not the truth in the *sacraments*, but only a kind of shadow and tradition of men.—With regard to *orders* among them, the discipline of the sect is this:—*first*, by the laying on of hands to receive some of their *auditors* into the

¹ Not, I conceive, as excluding the other subdivisions of the sect, with whom their differences were comparatively small; but as comprehending their whole body, contrasted with the so called Roman Church Catholic.

number of *believers*, who thenceforth have leave to attend at their prayers ; then, after sufficient trial, to lay on their hands again for the baptism of the Spirit, and so constitute them *elect*.—And now comes the new and strange assertion ; “ In their *diet* they forbid *milk*, and all made of it, and all that is procreated by copulation ; despise the *baptism* of the Romish Church, and condemn *marriage*.” The marriage rite said to be despised must be understood, I conceive, (like the baptismal) as that of the *Romanists*, then a *sacrament*, and of course to be performed alone in the Roman churches. For he observes after a while ; “ They have among them continent women, as they call them, widows, virgins, *their wives* also ; some of which are amongst the *elect*, others of the *believers* : as if in imitation of the Apostles, who had power to lead about women (or wives) with them.”¹—On the asserted abstinence and diet I shall observe presently.

Of the *other* variety of the heretics he speaks thus.—“ These deny that the body of Christ is made on the altar, because of the priests of the Church not being rightly consecrated. For they say that the apostolic dignity sitting in the chair of Peter,—forasmuch as it has mixed itself in secular affairs, and not waged God’s warfare as Peter did,—has deprived itself of the power of consecrating : and that what it has not itself, the Bishops, who live also like men of the world, cannot receive from it ; viz. the power of consecrating others. Thus,—though they allow them the power of preaching, and indeed defer to it, alleging Christ’s words, ‘ The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’ chair ; what therefore they bid you that do, —yet they *make void the sacraments*,—baptism alone excepted ; and allow this only in those who are come to age, adducing the text, “ Whosoever shall *believe* and be baptized shall be saved.”—As regards *marriage*, they allow that only between two virgins : grounding their doctrine on the texts following : “ What God hath

¹ In the above, I have given almost uniformly Evervinus’s words, as translated in the Facts and Documents ; only abridging, here and there, very slightly.

joined together let not man put assunder ;” “ Whosoever marrieth her that is divorced commits adultery ;”¹ and “ Let marriage be honourable to all, and the bed undefiled.”—They put no confidence in the *intercession of saints*. They maintain that *fastings* and other afflictions, *undertaken for sin*, are not necessary to the just or to sinners ; because that at what time soever the sinner repents of his sins, they are all forgiven him. They do not admit of any *purgatory* ; but that souls, as soon as they depart out of the bodies, do enter into rest or punishment ; proving it from the text of Solomon, ‘ Which way soever the tree falls, whether to the South or North, so it lies : ’² by which means they make void all the prayers and oblations of the believer for the deceased.—And all other things, which have not been established by Christ or his Apostles, they call superstitions.”

It would seem from Evervinus’ language as if the individuals burnt on the occasion he refers to, were chiefly, perhaps wholly, of the *former* of these two classes : and he further mentions of them that they spoke of their members as scattered almost every where, and of their heresy as having been concealed from the time of the martyrs, and preserved in *Greece* and some other countries ;³ thus expressly connecting themselves and it with the *Paulikians* of the Greek Empire, as its recognized parent-stock and founders. In this connexion and lineage, however, we can scarce doubt but that the others participated. For it appears from a Tract of Eckbert,⁴ abbot of a neighbouring convent,—addressed a very few years later to the Rector of the Cathedral of *Cologne*, on the subject of these same here-

¹ Do not these texts look as if the objection of the Paulikians was rather to the *dissolution*, than to the *formation* of marriages, as practised among the Romanists ? A person conversant with the history of those times will be well aware that the power of binding and loosing was then applied by the Pope and Church dignitaries to the sanctioning of divorcees and re-marriages, in a manner as unscriptural as gainful.

² The reader will do well to mark this reference to the *Old Testament* as authority.

³ Maitland, p. 349.

⁴ Copious extracts from Eckbert’s Tract are given by Maitland, p. 354, &c. The date of the Tract is stated as A. D. 1160.

tics,—that the two above-mentioned varieties,¹ (as well as others also alluded to by him as in his time existing,) were comprehended in the same great family or sect of *Cathari*, i. e. of the *Western Paulikians*, the offspring of those of the *East*.—And what then the points thus first developed of *difference*? It seems hinted as *one* by Evervinus, that the class first mentioned deferred to the *Greek connexion* more than the second, regarding the head-minister of the sect in the East as their own head, or, as Evervinus calls it, their *Pope*;² while the others recognized no such Pope or head. A *further* point of difference appears in this, that the former (at least the *elect* of the former) practised an *abstinence* from flesh-meat and certain other kinds of food; which is not noted, but rather the contrary, of the latter.³ Of any difference of views as to *marriage* I say nothing, because it is difficult to form a satisfactory judgment from accounts so self-contradictory, and therefore unintelligible.—On the other hand it is sufficiently evident that with respect to the doctrines of *purgatory*, *intercession of the saints*, and other *idolatrous superstitions* of the Church of Rome then established, not one division only of the Paulikian sectaries reprobated them, but all;—just as they also united to reprobate the *Romish sacraments*, *church*, and *priesthood*.—As to the *rule of abstinence* now practised, (*if Evervinus be correct*,⁴) by one subdivision

¹ *Ibid.* p. 354.

² This is, I believe, the earliest notice of a minister or bishop of the Paulikians in Bulgaria assuming in his sect any such universal pre-eminence. (I refer not to the *name*; for *Papa*, originally and till A. D. 600 meant only Bishop, even in the West, but to the pre-eminence.) It may be regarded, I conceive, as a mark that corruption from the simplicity that is in Christ had already begun among the Sectaries in the *East*. Much earlier, however, it can scarce have been; as neither *Cedrenus* in the xith century, nor *Zingabenus* in the xiith, take any notice of it. Other marks followed afterwards. After a while (so Gibbon tells us) the Paulikians of Bulgaria and Bosnia came to be superstitious *worshippers of the Cross*,—the very worship against which they had before most strongly protested.

In a letter from Conrad, the Pope's Legate, of the date of 1223, given by Matthew of Paris, and quoted by Maitland, *Facts and Doc.* p. 191, and by Hallam, *Mid. Ages*, iii. 465, we find a curious notice of the Bulgarian Pope, as then recognized by certain of the body in France and Spain: "Circà dies istos hæretici Albigenses constituerunt sibi Anti-Papam in finibus Bulgariae, nomine Bartholomæum."

³ See what they say of the needlessness of *fasting*, &c. undertaken for sin.

⁴ It must be remembered that there is not a whisper of charge of the same

of the Paulikians in Western Europe, I cannot but call attention to it as the earliest credible notice, if I mistake not, of any such practice; and must at the same time suggest the jeopardy in which it placed the future Christianity of those that embraced it. In the third and fourth centuries, (indeed earlier,) a similar rule of abstinence was embraced, as we know, by many Christians with good intentions; and very soon, as we also know, it degenerated into a system of mere asceticism and superstition, instead of real religion. Was not the same result likely to follow, sooner or later, with these Paulikians? In effect we have subsequent notices of the rule as still pursued by one of the Paulikian branches, (not all,) through the next century: until the celebrated examination of heretics recorded in the *Codex Tolosanus*, exhibited this branch as by that time altogether destitute of their old apparent vitality in religion, and lapsed into mere superstitious forms and fanaticism.—Who can overestimate the peril of a first departure from the simplicity that is in Christ?—Of this however more hereafter.

The necessary limits imposed on me forbid my making reference to that Tract of the Monk ECKBERT just alluded to; except as evidence, that up to the year 1160 the same heretics continued to abound in the neighbourhood of Cologne,—that it was their habit to defend their tenets by words of Holy Scripture,—that they did this so speciously that even the more learned of the clergy were (*to their disgrace*, says Eckbert¹) very generally unable to reply, and that they were mercilessly persecuted even to death, and endured it with martyrs' constancy.²—Nor again must I notice an account of some

kind against the *Eastern* Paulikians, even up to the 13th century. See Cedrenus and Zingabenus.

¹ Facts and Doc. p. 315.

² In Gretzer's Prolegomena to Reiner and other anti-heretical writers, in the B. P. M. xxv. 253, the following example is given from Godefrid's Annals; ad ann. 1163.

“In this year certain heretics of the sect of the Cathari, coming from the parts of Flanders to Cologne, took up their abode secretly in a barn near the city. But as on the Lord's day they did not go to church, they were seized by the neighbours, and detected. On this being brought before the Catholic Church, when after long examination respecting their sect they would be convinced by no evidence

of the same class of heretics apprehended about the same time at VEZELAI in Burgundy, under the curiously coupled appellations of *Telonarii* and *Poplicani*,¹ further than to say that their one grand error was reported to be “the making void all the sacraments of the Church,—the baptism of children, the eucharist, the sign of the life-giving cross, the sprinkling of holy water, the building of churches, payments of tithes and oblations, marriage, monastic institutions, and all the duties of priests and ecclesiastics:” and that, though for 60 days efforts were made repeatedly to convert them, they continued stedfast, excepting *two*, in their heresy, and were burnt.—I must hasten on to the narrative given in William of Newbury of the *Publicani* condemned A. D. 1160, at the council of OXFORD. His account I shall translate literally. It is as follows.

“About the same time certain vagrants came into England of the class that they generally call *Publikani*. They were in number, counting both the men and women, somewhat more than 30. Dissembling their error, they entered the country peaceably; their object however being the propagation of that pestilential heresy. There was one *Gerard* leading them, to whom all looked up as their preceptor and head. For he alone was in some little measure literate; whereas the others were illiterate, and evidently rustic and unpolished, of the Teutonic language and nation. During a sojourn of

however convincing, but most pertinaciously persisted in their doctrine and resolution, they were cast out from the church, and delivered into the hands of laics. These, leading them without the city, committed them to the flames; being four men and one little girl (*juvencula*). The latter was by the compassion of the bystanders held back, with a view to her preservation: in hopes that terrified by the deaths of others, she might acquiesce in saner counsels. But suddenly escaping from the hands of those that held her, she resolutely cast herself into the flames, and perished.—It was in the Nones of August.”

¹ *Telonarii* is the *τελωναι* of the Greeks latinized. (See Ducange ad verb.) Hence the attachment of the term to the *Paulikians* of Western Europe seems to have arisen thus curiously. Their proper and original appellation, *Paulikiani*, was first corrupted through *Popolicani* (see p. 240) into *Publicani*: then, as *Publicani* was the rendering in the Vulgate Latin of the word *τελωναι* (*tax-farmers*) in the New Testament, this Greek word latinized was further attached as an equivalent.

some little time in England they added to their company one woman, and one only ; she having been circumvented by their poisonous whisperings, and fascinated (so the report is) by certain magic arts.—They could not long be hidden. Enquiries were made by some persons out of curiosity : and, forasmuch as they were of a foreign sect, they were seized, and kept in public custody. The King, unwilling either to dismiss or punish them without investigation, commanded an episcopal Council to be assembled at Oxford. There, when met in solemn assembly as on a matter of religion, they answered through him who was the literate among them ; and who, undertaking the cause, spoke for all that they were *Christians*, and revered the doctrine of the Apostles. Being interrogated in order on the articles of our sacred faith, they answered rightly indeed concerning the *substance of the heavenly Physician*,¹ but perversely concerning the *remedies* whereby he deigns to heal man's moral infirmity, i. e. the *divine sacraments* : expressing *detestation* of holy *baptism*, the *eucharist*, *marriage* ; and wickedly derogating from the Catholic unity, to which these divine assistances attach. When they were urged with evidence taken from sacred Scripture, they answered that they believed as they had been taught, but were unwilling to dispute concerning their faith. Then, admonished to do penance, and re-unite themselves to the body of the church, they despised that salutary council. The threats too which were piously set before them,—in order that they might retract through *fear*, if through no other motive,—they treated with derision ; absurdly applying to themselves those words of our Lord, “ Blessed are they who suffer persecution for righteousness' sake, since theirs is the kingdom

¹ “ De *substantiâ* quidem superni Medici recta ; de ejus vero remediis, quibus humanæ infirmitati mederi dignatur, id est divinis sacramentis, perversa dixerunt : sacrum baptisma, eucharistiam, conjugium detestantes ; atque unitati Catholicæ, quam hæc divina imbuunt subsidia, ausu nefario derogantes.”—Maitland, 514.—Peter de Clugny similarly speaks of Christ as the *caelestis medicus*. &c ; ubi sup. 1067 :—And so Basil much earlier, ‘Ο μέγας ἰατρος ἐκ παρθενικῆς ἀνατείλας παστῶδος. In Virg. Deiparam.

of heaven.”—Then the bishops, in order that the heretical poison might not be diffused more widely, having publicly pronounced them heretics, delivered them up to the catholic Prince for the infliction of corporal punishment. His command was that the mark of heretical infamy should be branded on their foreheads, and that they should be beaten with rods out of the city, before the eyes of the populace; strictly enjoining that no one should presume either to receive them under his roof, or minister to them any consolation. The sentence having been pronounced, they were led forth to that most just punishment: and they went rejoicing with light steps; their teacher going before them, and singing, “Blessed shall ye be when men shall hate you.” To such an extent had the spirit of seduction deceived them.—The woman indeed whom they had led astray in England, induced by fear of punishment, left them, confessed her error, and obtained reconciliation. But the hateful company of heretics suffered the just severity of having their foreheads cauterized; he who was their head, and as for a mark of his primacy, sustaining the disgrace of a *double* branding, one on the forehead, and one round the chin. Further, their garments being cut down to the girdle, they were publicly scourged, and with the sounding of the whips cast out of the city. After which, through the inclemency of the cold, (for it was winter,) and as no one shewed them even the slightest act of compassion, they perished wretchedly.”¹

I conclude my long historical *catena* with a notice of the heretics denominated *Boni Homines*,—one of the

¹ There is an allusion to this transaction in a Manuscript of Ralph de Coggeshal, author of the *Chronicon Anglicanum*, &c;—a writer nearly cotemporary, as the date of his death is 1228. “Nonnulli eorum,” he writes, (i. e. ‘impurissimæ sectæ Publicanorum,’) “in Angliam advenerant; qui apud Oxenefordiam deprehensi, jubente Rege Henrico II, clave candenti in frontibus deformiter sunt signati, et effugati.” He at the same time speaks of their being every where about that time or a little after, “sought out and punished mercilessly, especially by Philip, Count of Flanders, with a just cruelty:” and adds a few notices of their doctrines and habits that well agree with Evervinus’s statements, and others.’ See the extracts in Maitland’s *Facts and Doc.* p. 516.

titles of the *Cathari*¹ or *Paulikians* of Western Europe, and who are also said to have been *Henricians*, or followers of *Henry* of Italy, by the Benedictine historian of Languedoc² and others,³—that were examined and condemned at the Council of LOMBERS A.D. 1165. In answer to the several charges brought against them they thus replied: that for *inspired Scripture* they received the New Testament, and besides it, as appeared afterwards, Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms, in those points of testimony, and those only, which are authenticated by Christ and his apostles; ⁴—that, in regard of the *baptism of infants*, they would say nothing of their own, but only answer out of the Epistles and Gospels; ⁵—that the *sacrament of the body and blood of Christ* was consecrated by every good man, whether ecclesi-

¹ For the full account I may refer the reader to Harduin's Councils, vi. ii. 1645; and for copious extracts from it to Faber, pp. 220—224, or Maitland's Facts and Doc. pp. 139—145.

² Faber, p. 237.

³ "Verum ex locis quibus Cathari vixerunt, eorumque erroribus quos docuerunt, apparet eos non propriam hæresin condidisse; sed Henricianorum portionem fuisse, ac forte eisdem cum Albigenisibus." Sanderus ap. Harduin vi, ii. 1693.

⁴ Their answer, as recorded at the commencement of the examination, is so represented as if the accused rejected the Old Testament altogether: "Respondent quia non recipiebant legem Moysis ac Prophetas, seu Psalmos et Vetus Testamentum, nisi solummodo Evangelia, Epistolas Pauli, et septem Canonicas Epistolas, Actusque Apostolorum, et Apocalypsin." But in the President's pronounced judgment,—a judgment founded in each particular on the heretics' previous answers to the interrogatories put, and which discussed and replied to them at length, we find the following given as the *real* confession on this point of the accused; "Confessi sunt etiam isti hæretici se recipere Moysen et Prophetas et Psalmos in his tantum testimoniis quæ inducuntur à Jesu et Apostolis, et non in aliis." the Judge adding; "Nos vero dicimus quod si instrumentum vel scriptum testimonium proferatur, et in aliquâ parte sui credatur, debet totum credi, aut in nullâ parte sui recipi."—I conceive that the *inducuntur* cannot mean merely *quoted*, but *authenticated*.

On this passage (which is not given or alluded to by Mr. Maitland) Mr. Faber (p. 229) justly dwells as most important.—I may just remark in passing, that quoting from Hoveden, not from the Councils, Mr. F. gives the reading, "*Non enim dicimus,*" for Harduin's, "*Nos vero dicimus;*" making the nominative of the clause, in consequence of the negative particle inserted, the heretics accused, not the judges. But there can be no doubt, I conceive, of Harduin's being the true reading; as the same contrast of the *orthodox* opinion, in opposition to the *heretics'* opinion, runs through the Bishop's judgment.

⁵ From the following words in the Bishop's judgment on this point,—"*Si autem quaeratur cujus fide salvantur infantes, cum ipsi fidem non habeant, sine quâ impossibile est Deo placere, dicimus quia fide ecclesiæ vel fide patrinorum,*"—I infer that the passage from the Gospel in which the accused shaped their answer, was the same that is spoken of as urged by the Pctrobrussians, &c. viz. "Whoso believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" and that that from the Epistles was, "Without faith it is impossible to please God."

astic or layman, and that they who received it worthily were saved, while they who received unworthily received to themselves damnation ;¹—respecting *matrimony* they would only answer, as St. Paul, that man and woman were united to avoid fornication ;²—respecting *repentance*, and *confession*, and whether *fastings*, *mortifications*, and *alms* were necessary after repentance, in order to salvation,—that the Apostle James had said simply that they should confess one to another, and *so* be saved ; and that they did not wish to be better than the Apostle, or, like the Bishops, to add any thing of their own.—As to any direct and more full *confession of their faith*, they declined to make it to the Episcopal conclave examining them : only adding their belief of the *unlawfulness of oaths* ;³ and also, respecting the *priesthood*, that if persons were ordained to it in character different from what St. Paul had described in his Epistle, they were not Bishops or Priests, but ravening wolves and hypocrites, whom men ought not to obey.—When however upon this the presiding Bishop had proceeded to pass sentence on them as heretics, fortifying the judgment pronounced by arguments from Scripture,—they replied that the Bishop was a heretic, and not they ; that he was their enemy, and an enemy of God, and had not judged rightly ; and that they would not answer *him* concerning their faith ; the Lord having commanded them, “ Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep’s clothing, while inwardly they are ravening wolves.” But turning to the *people*, they said, “ We will confess now, out of love to *you*, and for *your* sakes. Hear our faith !—We believe in one living and true God, triune and one, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit ; and that the Son

¹ The Bishop’s judgment on this point insists on the *Romish priesthood* having alone the power to consecrate the elements, and this in the *Romish churches* simply and only.

² I must here also note for comparison the Bishop’s judgment. “ In quinto Capitulo convincimus et judicamus istos hæreticos esse Novi Testamenti auctoritate, quia *volunt confiteri* quod vir et mulier possint salvari, si carnaliter miscantur.” And he afterwards expresses himself thus ; “ *Videntur enim nuptiis detrahere, et eas damnare.*” This is very different from a forbidding of marriage as unlawful.

³ Grounded doubtless on Matt. v. 34, James v. 12.

of God took flesh, was baptized in Jordan, fasted in the desert, preached our salvation, suffered, died, and was buried, descended into hell, rose the third day, ascended into heaven, sent the Spirit the Paraclete to his disciples on the day of Pentecost, will come at the day of judgment to judge the quick and the dead, and that all will rise. We acknowledge also that what we believe with the heart we ought to confess with the mouth. We believe that he is not saved who does not eat the body of Christ; and that it is not consecrated except in the Church, and also not except by a Priest; ¹ and that it is not better done by a good, than by a bad Priest.² We believe also that no one is saved except by baptism; and that children are saved by baptism. We believe also that man and wife are saved, though carnally united; and that every one ought to admit of penitence (*accipere pœnitentiam*) in the heart and with the mouth, and of being baptized by a priest, and in the church! And, indeed, if any thing more (received) in the church could be shewn by the Gospels or Epistles, that they would believe and confess it."³

When pressed to *swear* to this confession, they declined, as judging oaths unlawful. Thus it was of no avail to their acquittal. Their condemnation was ratified, and subscribed to by the whole Council.

§ 5.—TRUE CHRISTIAN WITNESS CHARACTER OF THE EARLIER AND MIDDLE-AGE PAULIKIAN SECTARIES.

THUS have I by copious extracts, or abstracts, from writers cotemporary for the most part, and *all hostile*, set forth in the two last Sections the history of a conti-

¹ In this there is nothing inconsistent with what is recorded of the previous rejection of the Romish priesthood; because by Church they meant obviously their own, or rather Christ's true Church, and by the Priests, all true Christians; according to St. Peter's notable declaration, "Ye are a royal priesthood," &c. The same distinction was made in the Helvetic Confession, long afterwards.

² This seems to me an inconsistency, comparing it with what was said before; but the only one in the Confession.

³ This translation is copied from Maitland; p. 144.

nuous line of Paulikian dissentients from the established apostate Churches of Roman Christendom: tracing them down from their rise, about the middle of the viith century, through a period of above five hundred years, in part in Eastern Christendom, in part in the Western, to the rise and times of Petrus Valdo or rather Valdes, in the xiith. This was the *first* point that it needed I should develope, in my inquiry respecting the presumed EASTERN line of WITNESSES. It remains that we *consider* and *sift* the documentary evidence so set before us; with a view to deciding from it on the contested and very important point, whether these dissentients were, as asserted by the hostile chroniclers, *abominable heretics*,—or rather *real Christians*, witnessing, according to the Apocalyptic description, for Christ.¹ In doing this it may be convenient, in order to distinctness, to consider

¹ I add the extracts from Sergius given by Petrus Siculus, in order the further to assist the reader to a right conclusion on the truth of the question. They are extracts selected avowedly with a view to his inculpation, perhaps garbled, without the context, and with an enemy's gloss upon them. I will however subjoin a literal translation of them, that the reader may see the *worst* that Petrus could find against him in his own writings. (B. P. M. xvi. 762, 763.)

1. On the *founders* of the Paulikian churches.

..... "But this I say, that Paul founded the Church at Corinth; Sylvanus and Titus founded that which is in Macedonia; Timothy overlooked Achaia; Epaphroditus administered the Philippensian Church; and that of Laodicea and also that of Colosse were taught by Tychicus."

"Art thou not of Antichrist," exclaims Petrus Siculus, "to tell such lies?" He means in depicting the foundation and founders of the *Paulikian* churches under these evidently *figurative* names!—On reference to the Acts and the Epistles, the reader will see that the adaptation was thus far in good keeping; viz. that the original churches named, as well as those of the Paulikians named after them, were connected respectively with the teachers mentioned in association.

2. His advice to the general Paulikian body, after beginning the war of resistance at Argæus.

"I often admonished and urged them to abstain from making prisoners of the Romans; but they did not obey me."—And "why not then," says Petrus, "abandon thy office as their chief teacher?" And again: "I will convict thee from thy own words. Thou didst teach them (thou sayest) to *follow Christ's footsteps*. Why not then when persecuted flee from one city to another?"

3. To one *Leo Montanus*, who seems to have sought to make a schism among the Paulikians.

"Beware lest thou divide the faith which cannot bend. (Cave ne fidem divides inflexibilem.) For what accusation hast thou against me? Have I circumvented any? Have I acted proudly? Thou canst not say so: and if thou shouldest, thy testimony is not true. God forbid, however, that I should cherish hatred towards thee. I only pray thee that as thou hast received the Apostles and the four Prophets, (i. e. Evangelists, *Ruler*.) so thou wouldest receive the Pastors and Teachers; lest thou become a prey to the wild beasts."—Is not the allusion

the particulars of evidence *favourable* and *unfavourable* separately: there being thus suggested as my two main Heads in this Section,

I. THE OBVIOUS POINTS OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THESE PAULIKIANS AND THE FIGURED APOCALYPTIC WITNESSES:

II. THE ALLEGED POINTS OF DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE TWO, AND CHARGES OF HERESY AGAINST THE PAULIKIAN SECTARIES.

I. THE POINTS OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PAU-

here to 1 Pet. v. 8, "The devil who as a roaring lion," &c? If so, it is an indication that the Epistles of Peter were received by Sergius.

4. "The first fornication, or adultery,—that which we derive from Adam,—is a benefit. But the second is of greater guilt; that of which it is said, "He who fornicates sins against his own body." He proceeds; "Now we are the body of Christ: and if any one separate from the traditions of the body of Christ, (i. e. from those I have given,) he sins; since he follows those who teach other doctrine."

"The impure wretch," says Sergius, "to call *fornication* a benefit!"—I need hardly suggest to the reader that it is of spiritual fornication, according to the Scripture figure, that Sergius is speaking; meaning thereby man's original *apostacy* and *alienation* from God, *derived* from Adam. Respecting this, Augustine uses nearly the same figure. After speaking of the two harlots on whom Solomon pronounced judgment, as being typical, and representing Jews and Gentiles as both under sin, he observes; "Omnis enim anima quæ, deserta æternitate veritatis, terrenis sordibus delectatur fornicatur à Domino." Serm. x. 2, ad Pop. But how the original apostacy a benefit? Because where sin abounded, it gave occasion for grace much more to abound. "Oh! happy sin," said Luther, "which hast found such a Redeemer!" See p. 95 supra.

5. From a Letter to the Colonienses. "We sojourn among you," (I presume the word should be *commoramur*, not *commemoramus*, which gives no sense) "knowing beforehand the proof of your faith: that as the older churches have received and cherished (susceperunt) pastors and teachers, (i. e. says Petrus, Constantine and the other Paulikians,) so ye have received me, (as) a burning torch, a shining star, a guide to salvation; according to that which is written, If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light."—"Wretched man!" exclaims Petrus. "Paul called himself an abortion; and dost thou, Pharisee-like, call thyself a splendid torch, a guide to salvation! Thou, a blind leader of the blind!"

6. "Be imitators of me; and hold the traditions ye have received from me." Then, presently after; "Let no one seduce you in any wise! Having these promises from God, trust in them. For we write to you having confidence in our hearts: since as an imitator (of Christ) I am a good shepherd, a leader of that which is Christ's body, and a lamp of the house of God.—And I am ever with you, even to the end of the world (or of life, *sæculi*): for though absent in body, I am present in spirit with you.—Finally, rejoice! Be perfect! and the God of peace be with you!"—"Child of the Devil," says Petrus again; "to make thyself equal with God, as ever present with them!" Sergius' meaning however is evidently only the same as St. Paul's, Col. ii. 5.

The reader has now before him all that Petrus could extract or extort from Sergius' writings as most evil. May we not hope *even yet* that Scrgius' own writings may come to light?

LIKIAN SECTARIES AND THE FIGURED APOCALYPTIC WITNESSES.

And let me premise, ere entering on the investigation, that I shall under this head endeavour to keep separate what may be said of the two great divisions Eastern and Western of the sect; in case we should prefer to regard *certain* of those that have been noted in Western Europe, (as we may very reasonably,) to be of a different and *Western* original.¹

1. Then, in regard both of *ministers* and *congregations*, the *teachers* and the *taught*, (for the two are found constantly united together in the Paulikian histories, just like the symbols of the *olive-trees* and *candle-sticks* in the prefigurative vision,) it is notorious that they bore a continuous and unvarying protest against those grosser superstitions of *saint-mediatorship*, *image-worship*, and other kinds of *idolatry*, through which the so called christians of the Roman world had degenerated (even as the previous Apocalyptic prefigurations represented it²) into Gentiles of the outer court; and against which, consequently, witnesses answering to those of the Apocalypse must needs have testified.—Among the prominent charges urged against the Paulikians before the Patriarch of Constantinople in the 8th century,³ and by Photius and Petrus Siculus in the 9th, we find the following;—that they dishonoured the Virgin Mary, and rejected her worship,—denied the

¹ I allude particularly to the cases already noted as doubtful of *Berenger*, *De Bruys*, and *Henry*. To these some may add those at *Orleans* and *Arras*; the originators of the heresy in those places being said simply to have come from *Italy*; and very possibly therefore from its *Piedmontese Alpine Vallies*, rather than *Eastern Lombardy*, which the Paulikian immigrants perhaps rather frequented. So Dr. Gilly in his *Waldensian Researches*, Introd. Inquiry, &c.—I shall have to allude again to the *Waldensian* view of this point of doubt in the next Section.

² See Apoc. viii. 2; ix. 20.

³ See the account of the examination of *Genæsius*, surnamed *Timothy*, given in Petrus Siculus, *Bibl. Patr. Max.* Tom. xvi. p. 760: and of which an abstract will be found in my Appendix to this Volume.

Let me take this opportunity of observing that in the review of the subject now commencing, my references to *Petrus Siculus* will be, as before, to the Latin translation of the work given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima*, Tom. xvi. p. 754, &c.; and that I shall also have to refer to the transcript of the 1st chapter of *Photius'* Treatise in the sixth Volume of the *Bibliotheca*, p. 204, &c. as given by Zingabenus.

life-giving efficacy of the cross, and refused to worship it,—and gainsayed the awful mystery of the conversion of the blood of Christ in the eucharist ; while by others they are branded as the originators of the iconoclastic heresy, and the war against the sacred images.—In the first notice of the sectaries in Western Europe, I mean at *Orleans*, they were similarly accused of treating with contempt the worship of martyrs and saints, the sign of the holy cross, and mystery of transubstantiation ; and much the same too at *Arras*. So again the *Petrobrussians* were charged with the destruction of crucifixes as instruments of superstition, the denial of transubstantiation, and disbelief in purgatory and the efficacy of oblations and prayers for the dead :—and very much the same is Evervinus’s testimony respecting the heretics at *Cologne*, that of Ralph of Coggeshal respecting those at *Oxford*, and of St. Bernard respecting those he contended against at *Toulouse*.—The protestation of the Paulikian sectaries against these *grosser* superstitions of the established churches of Christendom was, for the 500 years we speak of, continuous.¹

2dly, though before the eyes of men the self-styled Catholics of the Eastern and Western Roman world seemed to constitute Christendom,—though they filled as it were (to borrow that Apocalyptic figure) the whole *visible temple*, and applied to themselves the same boast as the Jews of former times, “ The *temple* of the Lord, the *temple* of the Lord are *we*,”—yet did these Paulikians regard and speak of them, throughout, as those who belonged not to the Church of Christ, but, being apostates, belonged rather (still to follow up the Apocalyptic figure) to the *Gentile* or *outer court*.—For example, their founder *Constantine* did not attempt the amending or purification of the Church established : but leaving it, as that which was beyond remedy corrupt, entered his protest against its corruptions in a manner of all others the most decisive and striking ; viz. by the formation of a

¹ The reader will refer for authorities to the narratives previously given.

new and distinct church, professedly in contrast with the other, as being a *gospel* church. With similar feelings his eminent successor *Sergius* is recorded to have devoted his energies to the conversion of the members of the established Greek Church around him, under the belief that those who held its doctrines were on the way to destruction. The same is declared to have been the views of the sectaries in the time of *Petrus Siculus* and *Photius*; the same, two centuries after, in that of *Cedrenus*. Small as were their numbers, (and they were small enough to answer to the Apocalyptic symbol of Christ's *two Witnesses*,) yet they called their assemblies the *catholic Church*, and said, "We are *Christians*, you *Romans*."—At *Orleans*, though in a less open form of protestation, the *Canons* designated a change from the received faith to their own as a translation from an evil world to God's sanctuary. To the same effect was *Berenger's* notable saying, (though his conduct was not fully consistent with it,) "Through the unskilfulness of erring men, the Church perished: in us alone, and those who follows us, has the holy Church remained on earth:" and again that reported of *De Bruys*, "That all men present and past had been deceived, that the world was in the way to perdition, and God's grace with them only who agreed with him."¹ So, once more, it is related of the heretics at *Cologne*; "They say that the Church is only amongst them, because they only follow the steps of Christ."—And let me here observe on the claim noted at the same time as made by them, both for themselves and for their predecessors, of a kind of *special missionary appointment*, as from heaven, for the confession and propagation of Christ's Gospel truth: "We and our fathers *were born apostles*, and shall continue so to the end of the world." It is but the continued expression of what, according to *Petrus Siculus* and *Cedrenus*, was the light in which, *from the first*, the Paulikian sectaries regarded their ministers and teachers. "Constantine, and the others

¹ Allowance will of course be made for hostile exaggeration in this reported expression of his sentiment.

that have risen after him, they count as among Christ's apostles." ¹—Does not the mind revert, on reading this, to what was foreshewn to St. John of Christ's *especially commissioning* two Witnesses, to testify for Him through the dark period of the Apostacy?

3dly, as the Apocalyptic witnesses are said to have *observed the commandments and word of God*,² so the adherence of the Paulikian dissentients (professedly at least) to the gospel-word, as the alone ground of their faith, subject of their preachings and teachings, and rule of life, is all along marked most strongly. After his own conversion of sentiment, through the perusal of the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament, *Constantine* distinctly founded his new sect upon *them*: making it a law to his followers to read nothing else whatever besides these sacred books; and this, we must remember, in a text confessed by the enemies of the sect to be pure and unadulterated. The fulfilment and the effect of this rule meets us in the subsequent annals of the sect continually. It was through the Paulikian woman's repeating and reasoning from these inspired Scriptures, that Sergius was induced to join it. It is the later testimony of Petrus Siculus, that in his time its members universally were familiar with every part of the Gospels and Epistles; and again that it was by arguing from *them* that they felt confident, wherever they went in missionary enterprise, (so as they were just then about doing into Bulgaria,) of being able effectually to sow the seeds of their heresy.—After their migration into *Western Europe*, no change appears in the habit. It was with the "sweetness of the divine word," that Arefaste's chaplain was intoxicated, as the chronicler reports it, by the *Canons of Orleans*; and through "its being covered up in the words of the divinely inspired volumes," that they sought to instil their heresy into Arefaste himself. The monk Eckbert complains that

¹ Petr. Sic. B. P. M.759; also Cedrenus apud Dowling, p. 19.—The same is Bernard's report; "They call themselves *Apostolics*, or *successors of the Apostles*."

² I unite the notices in Apoc. xii. 17, xiv. 12, and xx. 4

the Cathari, that is the Paulikians, at *Cologne*, so wielded this weapon, as that few of the catholic Clergy could withstand it. At the synods of *Arras* and *Lombards*, as elsewhere, we find the sectaries referring to the written word as the sole rule of their faith, and rejecting uncompromisingly whatever might not be proved therefrom:—a rule, let me observe, the more remarkable when contrasted with the very opposite rule of faith, built on Fathers, Councils, and traditions, enjoined on and received, throughout those five centuries, by catholic Christendom.¹—Once more, it was by the remembrance and recitation to each other of the promises and declarations of the Gospel, that they cheered themselves when condemned to tortures and to death. Witness the notable examples at *Orleans* and *Oxford*.

And let me not pass to another head without observing that this conversancy of the Paulikians, both ministers and people, men and women, with the Holy Scriptures, at least those of the New Testament,² while all the rest of the Christian world was involved in comparative ignorance of them, is, as a mere *literary phenomenon*, very striking. The question arises what might have been their means of effecting it from generation to generation. Mere oral tradition seems insufficient. But I seem to myself to discern it in the recorded *title* of one of the *ministerial orders* of the sect, compared with the rule laid down, as we have seen, by its founder Constantine, that its members should read nothing but the Epistles and Gospels; I mean that of *Notarii*. For I cannot suppose with Mr. Dowling, after Wolf and Valesius,³ that

¹ In the Acts of the Second Council of Nice, we find an anathema against those who received not this latter rule. "His qui dicunt quod, nisi de Veteri ac Novo Testamento evidenter fuerimus edocti, non sequamur doctrinas sanctorum Patrum, neque sanctorum Synodorum, atque traditionem ecclesiæ catholicæ, Anathema!" Hard. iv. 42.

Petrus Siculus, in true Nicene spirit, speaks of the Fathers as the "doctores qui ad perfectionem educarent, quorum decretis universa Christi ecclesia continetur;" p. 755:—observing of the Paulikians a little after, (p. 758) "Nec Patres admittunt,—ne fundamenta nefariæ Sectæ eversa triumphantur."

² The charge of rejecting the *Old Testament* will be examined afterwards.

³ "Concerning the word *Notarii*, J. C. Wolfius has the following remark in his Note on the passage in Photius: "Ex. Henr. Valesii ad Socratis Histor. Ecclesiast. v. 22 observationibus patet Episcopos ad manus habuisse eruditos

the office of these ministers was merely to register the acts of the Paulikian churches, and at times to read the Scriptures in their assemblies. I conceive it must have been also, according to the usual meaning of the word *notary*, to *write out copies* for the people of what it was enjoined on the people they should read, that is of the Holy Scriptures;—and this with the fidelity which in other transcriptions was the *sworn duty* of the *notary's* office.¹ Supposing it so, there must have been by this means, conjointly with that of the public *preaching*, a supply to the Paulikians of that double means of spiritual nourishment,—the word *written*, for *reading* in private, and the word *preached*,—which Vitranga supposes to be meant by the Apocalyptic symbol of the *two tubes* for transmission of the pure olive-oil to the golden candlestick.²—And thus the burning of the candlestick among *them* will be accounted for; just as the quenching and the prolonged darkness of the candlestick among the Greeks and Romanists is to be accounted for by the choking up of both these sources of nourishment:—the charge made against them by the Paulikians in both East and West being but too true, of in part adulterating, in part suppressing God's word among the people; while as to the *preaching*, we have already traced its neglect for ages throughout Romish Christendom.

4thly, although from first to last a cry was raised against the Paulikians for secret *immoralities*, even as a

adolescentes, qui et acta ecclesiastica exciperent, et prout res ferebat, instar lectorum, populo sacras literas prælegerent. Atque hoc nomine Pauliciani illi sacerdotes suos *Notarios* appellasse videntur." Dowling, p. 19.

[Indeed in Valesius' Note I find, on reference, that the Notarii are spoken of there also as "*scribe*." 2nd Ed.]

¹ E. g. In a copy of a letter of Pope Alexander about the times we write of, I find the following subscription: "Ego Otto, *Notarius* Sacri Palatii, authenticum hujus Bullæ Domini Alexandri Papæ bullatum vidi et legi: et sicut in illo reperi ita in hoc scripsi; nihil addens, vel minuens, aut mutans, præter punctum, litteram, et syllabam." Hard. vi. ii. 1420.

We may compare what Muston says of the *Waldensian* Ministers of a later date; "Leur occupations, outre le service regulier des églises, étoient de *récopier les Évangiles* et leurs Traités religieux. i. 461.

² "Tubi bini significant duo illa instrumenta per quæ institutiones ministrorum Dei transeunt et parantur, ad communem ecclesiæ usum,—*prædicationem oralem* et *Scripturam*." p. 626.—Of course, if there are proved two distinct lines of Witnesses, the dual number of the two tubes will have reference to *them*.

part of their religious ritual and system, (*just like that against the early Christians*,¹)—a cry echoed in the East by Petrus Siculus, Photius, Cedrenus, and by others in the West continued downwards to St. Bernard,—yet in no case do we find authentication of the charge : on the contrary from time to time there transpires in other statements of the accusers that which is virtually a contradiction to those charges, and at least probable evidence of the morals taught and generally followed being, (so as with Christ's Witnesses they must have been,) unimpeachable.

Thus in regard of their founder *Constantine*, if Petrus Siculus represents him as having embraced the foul crimes and the impurities of Basilides,² it is but just after stating him to have planned the revival of the heresy *in another form*, because of having observed that the *foul crimes* of the old impure sect of the Manichees, as well as their impious sayings, were an abomination and horror to all men ; also, that, in so reviving it, he did it *under a show of piety*.³ Again, in respect of *Sergius*, although he heaps on him the most virulent abuse, yet it appears from the narrative, both that this eminent Paulikian was before his conversion to the sect a young man

¹ Athenagoras, in the second century, thus briefly sums up the charges of immorality and impiety made against the early Christians : *Τρια ἡμῶν ἐπιφημισῶν ἐγκλήματα, — ἀθεοσητα, Θυεστέια δειπνα, Οιδιποδείας μιξεις* (Pro Christianis, p. 30.) So again Justin Martyr, Apolog. i. 35 ; and, more fully, Minutius Felix, in his Octavius, chs. ix, xxx.—If the reader will compare these with the charges of immorality made against the Paulikian dissentients,—as, for example, in the East by Cedrenus very briefly, *Παση ἀκολασια και μασμφ ἑκατερας ἀνθρωπων φυσεως ἀδιαφορωσ και ἀδεωσ χρωνται*, (Dowling, p. 20,)—in this following Photius, who adds further, “*adeo ut ipsorum quidam cum matribus consuetudinem habere dicantur*,” (Bibl. P. Max. xix. 205,)—or much more at large, in Western Europe, by the Biographer of Arefaste, in his account of the heretical transactions at Orleans, already alluded to,—the resemblance between the two will be found, if I mistake not, so striking, as to satisfy him of the latter being but a copy and imitation of the former.

Let me add that precisely the same charges were made by Romanists against the morals of the *Waldenses*, even up to the year 1783. See Muston i. 489 ; . . . “*et dans les tenebres ils renouvelaient les infamies des Manicheens*,” &c.

² “*Basilidis infanda flagitia et impuritates amplectens, novus repente perniciosæ pestis ductor exiliit*.” Petr. Sic. p. 759.

³ “*Ille qui jampridem nefariam atque impuram hæresim suam, (i. e. of Manicheism) propter impia dicta fœdæque flagitia quæ Manichæorum scriptis continentur, omnibus odio atque horrori esse animadverterat, uti pietatem pestem illam renovare in animum induxit*.” Ibid.

of excellent moral character ; and that afterwards, “rejecting,” as Petrus expresses it, “all the vices and lusts of the Manicheans, he fraudulently simulated virtues, whereby the better to deceive, and so as, although a wolf, to appear vested before the world in sheep’s clothing.”¹ Indeed in one of the very few and brief extracts given by Petrus from Sergius’ letters, we find the latter thus asserting, in the way of challenge to one that had opposed him, the unimpeachability of his moral character ; “What accusation hast thou against me? Have I defrauded any one? Have I acted with pride or overbearing? Thou canst not say it.”²—As to the Paulikians *generally*, Petrus relates without observation on it, as if that which he might have difficulty in disproving, their disclaimer of the *impurities* of the Manichees ; adding, as that which he thought he *could* maintain against them, “The *doctrines* of Manes they carefully hold and defend.”³—No doubt individual blots may be inferred from his narrative to have existed among them ; just as we learn from the epistles to the Corinthians, and others, that there were blots on the early Christian Church. Such I incline to think was the case of *Baanes* ;—the only Paulikian of eminence, if I mistake not, against whose morals Petrus Siculus makes any credible⁴ inculpatory statement, previous to the great multiplication of their body, and unhappy wars of resistance against the imperial Greeks that followed, at Mounts Argæus and Tephricæ. And it seems to me very observable that in this case the corroboratory circumstance associated with

¹ “Audio te, Sergi, bonum virum usquequaque.”—“Hic (Sergius), rejectis omnibus illorum flagitiis ac libidinibus, blasphemias veluti salubria dogmata complexus, virtutes nonnullas callidè simulabat ; pietatisque specie, velut ovinâ pelle, lupum tegens, pietatis autem abnegans virtutem, iis qui ipsum norant certissimus salutis ductor videbatur.” Petri Sic. Ib. 761, 762. He elsewhere repeats the same character of him : “Virtutum fraudulentus simulator, quippe hâc arte multis fucum faciebat.” And, “Æmulabatur virtutem improbitas.”

² “Quam habes contrâ nos accusationem? Num aliquem circumveni? Aut superbè egi? Non potes dicere.” Ib. p. 763. See the extract p. 271 *suprà*.

³ “Qui tametsi à Manicheorum impuritibus se alienos dicitant, sunt tamen dogmatum ipsorum vigilantissimi custodes et propugnatores.” Ibid. 754. He adds presently after, “Quandam præ se ferentes morum sanctimoniam.” Ib.

⁴ I mean beyond his usual vague declamatory charges, and with any statement accompanying of connected and authenticating circumstances.

it in Petrus' narrative is *Sergius' public reproof of the offender*, and renunciation thenceforward of connection with him and his disciples.¹—Turning to *Western Europe*, the reader will not forget how at *Orleans* the Canons proselyted are allowed on all hands to have been those of the clergy who, for sanctity and general excellence of character, had for many years enjoyed the highest reputation; ²—or how at *Arras* this was professed, and not gainsaid, as their rule of life, “to separate from the world, to restrain the flesh from concupiscence, to live by the labors of their hands, to injure none, and to shew love to all who united in the same views of life and doctrine.”³ Besides which I must not pass without allusion the eulogies on the character of *Berenger*,⁴ and the non-impeachment of that of *De Bruys*: or *St. Bernard's* testimony to the *Petrobrussian* sectaries; “If you ask of the conversation of these people, nothing is more irreprehensible: what they say they do: they attack no one, circumvent no one, defraud no one.”⁵ Once more (for *Reinerius Saccho's* testimony to the same effect must be reserved for later notice, as he lived after the epoch which bounds our present inquiry, that of the teaching of *Petrus Valdensis*) it must be remembered that this their unimpeachableness of moral character was publicly appealed to by the *Paulikians* at *Cologne*,⁶ as Christ's

¹ “Bis terque in faciem restitit Baanæ, spurio discipulo suo et symmistæ; fictaque pietatis imagine reprehendere illum coram universis auditoribus aggressus est, non fidei nomine, sed propter immania et nefanda ejus facinora.” And again; “Sergius fœdam hominis colluviem quam docebat Baanes detestans, palamque illam læcessans, hæresim in duas partes discidit.” *Ib.* 763. What the crimes charged on Baanes were, we are not told. But could the public inculpation of them have been so made by *Sergius*, and so followed up, had the moral sense of the *Paulikians* been as depraved and abandoned as the hostile writers against them would represent?

There is the further charge made against them by *Petrus* and *Photius* of *abominable falsehood*, in respect of the *teachers* calling themselves *Sylvanus*, *Tychicus*, &c., and their *Churches*, the *Macedonian*, *Achaian*, *Colossian*, &c., though these men had been dead many hundred years, and the places were distant many hundred miles!—The reader will not require any refutation of *this* asserted violation of moral rectitude.

² See Note 4, p. 243.

³ See p. 249.

⁴ See p. 251.

⁵ “Si conversationem interrogas nihil irreprehensibilium; et quæ loquitur factis probat. Jam, quod ad vitam moresque spectat, neminem concutit, neminem circumvenit, neminem supergreditur.” *Bernard* super *Cantic.* *Serm.* 65. 5; quoted by *Faber*, p. 76.

⁶ See p. 259.

own test and evidence of real Christianity ; “ By their fruits ye shall know them :—our fruits are the footsteps of Christ.”¹

5thly, it is obvious that the *privations* and *sufferings* entailed on them by their profession of faith were such

¹ There is less need of insisting on the evidence in favour of the morality of the Paulikians, inasmuch as both *Mr. Dowling*, with reference to the parent stock in the East, and *Mr. Maitland*, with reference to the most questionable of all its Western offshoots at the commencement of the xvth century, alike disclaim belief in the immoralities charged on them. The former thus expresses himself, p. 33. “ I take no notice of the charges of licentiousness brought against the Paulikians by Photius and Petrus. The declamatory charges of controversial writers deserve to go for little.” * *Mr. Maitland* thus: “ I do not find in any of these hundreds of *Sentences* and *Confessions*,” (i. e. in the records of the Inquisition at Toulouse, from 1307 to 1323,) “ either as a matter of charge by the Inquisitors, or self-accusation, or charge by a Confessor, any the slightest attempt, directly or indirectly, to impeach the character of any Albigensian or Waldensian, with reference to chastity, temperance, or honesty.” *Facts and Doc.* p. 224.

It is to be regretted that too many controversial writers opposed to the Paulikians and Waldenses exhibit no such candour as *Mr. Maitland*; but act on the principle of at once receiving and retailing every charge of evil against them, as if true, without any consideration of the credibility of the evidence supporting it, or of existing counter-evidence. Among them *Bossuet*, in his famous *Histoire des Variations*, stands pre-eminent. To such how applicable is Tertullian's indignant remonstrance against similar conduct on the part of the Roman magistrates of his time. “ When others are accused, they are permitted freely to speak to prove their innocence, and have the privilege of replying and objecting. Again, on accusation of murder, sacrilege, incest, or treason, (the ordinary heads of accusation against us,) ye demand in corroboration proof of the act, the number of the perpetrators, the place, manner, time, accomplice, companions. In our case no care of this kind is taken, though it is equally necessary that whatever is falsely asserted should be elicited: as, upon how many infants each had already fed,—how many incestuous crimes he had hidden in darkness,—who were employed to prepare the human banquet,—what dog to extinguish the lights,” &c. *Apolog.* ch. 2. He then contrasts with these accusations the favourable report of their morals; drawn from Christian confessions, by *Pliny*: just as a Paulikian might have referred to the simple statement of the morals of the sect made by members of it, as at Arras or Cologne.

* He adds, “ And it must be confessed that, though such charges were often urged against the Gnostic and Manichæan sects, it is not easy to reconcile them with the genius of the Oriental system.” Which statement cannot be passed over without exception and protest: seeing that it is not on the ground of *connexion* with the Manichees or Gnostics that we assert their innocence, but on that of their being, both in doctrine and character, a sect *altogether aliene* from them. In fact, instead of *Mr. Dowling's* inclination to regard immorality as foreign to the genius of *these* heretical sects being well founded, there is extant in the very gems and medals of the *Gnostics* sufficient evidence (independent of concurrent Patristic testimony) to convict them of the grossest impurity; (See *Mr. Walsh's* interesting little volume on early Christian Coins and Gems, p. 69, &c.)—and, as to the *Manichees*, their *own authorized writings*, publicly appealed to by *Augustine*, and not repudiated, exhibit them in a character yet worse and more depraved. (See for example, the Acts of the Dispute with Felix, Book ii. Chap. vii; or the *De Hæres.* Chap. xlvi.)

as to make the mourning garb of *sackcloth* their fit clothing:—as also that under them they exhibited a *self-denial, unwearied zeal, constancy, and fortitude*, through life and unto death, just as if there was some superhuman power sustaining them; even a power such as St. John was told of in those words of the Apocalypse, “*I will give power to my two witnesses.*”—Denounced as they were from the first as Manichean heretics, they were from the first a class proscribed and without the pale of the law;¹ and thus both their property and their lives exposed from day to day to forfeiture. Yet where was ever exhibited more earnest or more enduring zeal than in the

¹ “Hoc siquidem ad cætera sua egregia facinora divini atque orthodoxi Imperatores addiderant, ut Manicheos Montanosque capitali puniri sententiâ jubèrent, eorumque libros, quocumque in loco inventi essent, flammis tradi; quòd si quis uspiam eosdem occultasse deprehenderetur, hunc eundem mortis pœnæ addici, ejusque bona in fiscum inferri.” Petr. Sic. p. 759. The anti-Manichæan laws here referred to were begun by Valentinian I. A. D. 372, and added to by Theodosius the Great, A. D. 381. They may be seen in the Theodosian Code.

The Paulikians being condemned as Manichees, the penalty against harbouring or concealing *Manichees* was of course applied to the crime of harbouring or concealing *them*, throughout the Greek empire. And as in the *East*, so in the *West* afterwards, laws of the same penal character against the same crime were enacted, beginning in the xith century;—an early specimen of which has been already given (see p. 250) from the Council of Rheims, A. D. 1049.

May we not discover in these laws, and the position in which they placed the Paulikians, an explanation of one of the names affixed to them, of which I do not remember to have seen any solution, I mean that of *Αθιγγανοί*?—The term is first applied to them, I believe, by *Theophanes*, an historian who died about A. D. 817; and consequently at a period when the Paulikians had retired to Mount Argæus, and begun resistance to their Imperial persecutors. The Manichæans, he says, “now called *Paulikians* and *Athingani*.” It strikes me that the appellation may have been given them from their being thus both legally and practically cut off from all contact with society; and, on their side, after the commencement of their resistance, and through distrust, disallowing the Roman Greeks' approach and touch.—In a Tract on Heretics by Timothy, Presbyter of Constantinople, (given in F. Combefis' *Historia Monothelitarum*, Paris, 1648, p. 456,) I find the following notice of a class of heretics called at the same time *Athingani* and *Melchisedeciani*, *Μελχισεδεκίανιοι*, *ὅτι νυν Αθιγγανοί προσαγορευομενοι*, *ὅτι . . . μητε ανθρωπον απτεσθαι αυτων ανεχομενοι*, *αλλα καν δωη αυτοις αρον, η υδωρ, η ετερον τι ειδος, καταθεσθαι κελευσθαι. και ετως αυτοι προσερχομενοι αιρσιν αυτα. Ωσαυτως και αυτοι ετεροις μεταδιδωσιν' δδεν και Αθιγγανοι, παρα το μη ανεχεσθαι εαυτης προσψανειν, ητοι θιγειν τινος, (η) προσαγορευθησεν*. This passage seems to confirm my suggestion; especially as compared with Peter Siculus' statements. For he says in one place, (p. 762) that before Sergius' time the Paulikians “*fugiendi hominibus et abominandi passim judicabantur;*” and, in his Letter to the Bulgarian Archbishop, that this was still the only right or safe way of dealing with them; “*Tutissimus erit portus si illos, tanquam picula quædam, aversati fuerint.*” p. 754. Shunned themselves, even like lepers, it would needs follow that they would suspect and shun others.—As to the precise heretics meant by Timothy, they were evidently not the *Melchisedeciani* of the 2nd century mentioned by Theodoret, and who were charged with believing Melchisedec to have been an

profession and propagation of their doctrines? The statement of Petrus Siculus, "that they put every spring in motion, and refused no danger, in order with whomsoever it might be possible to infuse the poison of their damnable sentiments,"¹ is one on which their whole history is a commentary. Like Simeon, those that possess property had to "leave all," on the very undertaking of the work; like Sergius, to labor with their own hands,² while fulfilling it. Yet was the *all* left, and the life of *labor, poverty, and suffering*, undertaken and continued, not by one but by many:—in the *East* up to the amnesty accorded by John Zimisces near the end of the xth century;³ (I date the term no earlier because, even after the gathering to Mounts Argæus and Tephrike, life was still to them a life of privations, and the remnant within the limits of the Greek Empire *hunted out* to be *put to death*;⁴) and from that time, and ever after, in the *West*.⁵

Then consider them on the threatening and in the

appearance of Jehovah: a doctrine by the way very innocent, and of which who can certainly say that it is not true? It was not these: for the writer says, "They who are *now* called Athingani," and he lived evidently, from his passing notice of the Paulikians, later than the 7th century. May it not then have been another appellation, and in the same sense, of these *Paulikian Sectarics*? If so, it suggests to us views of Christ in his character of *High Priest*, as held by them, full of interest.

¹ "Omnem movent funem, nullumque recusant periculum, quo damnatarum opinationum suarum pestem quibuscumque possint infundant." P. Sic. p. 754.

² I have already presumed "*genibus* meis laborans," in the B. P. M. 762, to be a misprint for *manibus*.—The sectaries at Arras speak in similar manner of their life of labour; and so too those at Cologne. St. Bernard too again of those he was conversant with; "Panem non comedit otiosus. Operatur manibus unde vitam sustineat." Sup. Cant. Serm. 65. 5.

³ See p. 239.

⁴ Of the Paulikians settled at *Tephrike*, &c. Petrus Siculus says; "Ab hominum cœtibus secreti loca deserta, velut ipsi mali dæmones, insident:" a representation that indicates no state of ease or enjoyment:—and of those in the Greek Empire; "Qui per Romanum Imperium ad mortem propter hæresim istam petebantur." Ibid. p. 763.

⁵ One of their most common names in the West was *Paterini*: of which the Edict of Frederic II, (A. D. 1244) gives this account; "In exemplum martyrum qui pro fide catholicâ martyria subierunt, *Patarenos* se nominant, velut expositos passioni."

Bossuet endeavours to negative the force of the argument here used, by adducing the statement of *Faustus* the *Manichee*, as to the life of privation and poverty to which *he* had subjected himself through that religious profession. (Variat. xi. 49.) But he does not add Augustine's counter-statement, immediately following, of the *gold* (aurum in arcellis) that he knew him to have in reality accumulated, and the bed of down (eaprinæ lodices) and luxury with which he shocked the humble habits of his poor father. Cont. Faust. v. 5.

immediate prospect of *cruel death*. It is said of Constantine by Petrus Siculus, that the reason of his casting aside the name and the books of the Manichees, when in a new form reviving Manicheism, was fear from having seen many slain on account of that profession by the sword.¹ Again, 500 years after Constantine, the Monk Eckbert imputes to the Paulikians of his time a similar concealment of their real sentiments from fear of death; saying that, *like thieves confessing under the gallows*, these heretics confessed and maintained their errors only when left without hope of life.² These assertions are among the many palpable and shameless falsehoods which he who runs may read in the anti-Paulikian historians. Was it through shrinking from death that Constantine disowned Manicheism? The profession he embraced instead of it, was that which exposed him just as much, indeed more, than Manicheism itself to death;³ and after a few years, in effect, brought him to suffer it, in the cruel form of stoning. Was it because they could not help themselves, and were remedilessly doomed to suffer whether they maintained their profession or not, that the Paulikians, either then or afterwards, held firm to their faith, and refused recantation? The very contrary is the recorded fact. We read respecting that earliest of their persecutions, how it was the royal command that the *disciples of Constantine* should be distributed through the churches, and instructed in order to their conversion, with *promise* in such case of *free pardon*: but that the wretches preferred to die impiously in

¹ "Manichæorum scripta abjecit hanc maximè ob causam, quòd multos videbat eo nomine gladio cædi." Ibid. p. 759.

² "Si aliquis vestrum pro errore suo deprehensus fuerit et deductus ante iudices ecclesiæ, aut omnino negatis fidem vestram, aut tunc primùm aliquos errores vestros confitemini cùm de vitâ amplius non speratis. Sed illa confessio non est ad gloriam vobis; et est quasi confessio furis; qui, cùm de vitâ suâ desperat, latrocinia sua impudenter confitetur sub laqueo." Facts and Doc. p. 510.

³ The account, for example, of the free public dispute between Felix the Manichean and Augustine, shews that in the case of the Manichees the penal laws were not executed. They are alluded to by Felix as that which *embarrassed* him, but nothing more. See August. Tom. viii. p. 478. (Benedict, Edit.) Indeed Augustine expressly notes the fact in his Treatise against *Faustus*, lb. 199; "Propter Christianorum temporum mansuetudinem quàm parva et propè nulla patiemini!"

their error, rather than by repentance to obtain both temporal and eternal salvation.¹ In like manner under Constantine's successor *Simeon*, when the Paulikians were all gathered together and examined by the authorities, it was understood that *none but the pertinacious* would be condemned to suffer; yet all, notwithstanding, adhered to their error, and were all in consequence burnt together on a vast funeral pile raised for the occasion.²—At *Orleans* the Canons were reasoned with “from the first hour to the ninth,” in order to recover them from their heresy; with *promise* implied of *pardon* if they retracted, as well as threat of burning if they persisted; and two out of the 15 or 16 took advantage of the offer, and so escaped, but none else.³ The same was the case, as described by Evervinus, at *Cologne*; ⁴ the same at *Vezelai*,⁵ the same at *Oxford*.⁶—And what is further most observable on this head, is the spirit of united *joy* and *meekness* that marked their constancy in suffering;—a spirit so different from the proud impassiveness of the stoic philosopher, or the ferocious brava-doing under torture of the Indian savage. The brevity of Petrus Siculus' narrative prevents me from referring (as I doubt not, had it been more circumstantial, I might have done) to the deaths of *Constantine* and *Simeon* as examples. At *Orleans* however, and at *Oxford*, the records already cited present us with exemplifications in point very striking. At *Cologne* too Evervinus marked it. He expresses his astonishment, as we have seen, to St. Bernard, at the manner in which the heretics entered to the stake, and bare the torment of the fire, not only

¹ “Simeon, ne quid regii mandati præteriret, Constantini discipulos, quo ad sanio rem mentem reverterentur, ecclesiis commendat. Sed illi haudquaquam conversi sunt: malueruntque in errore suo impiè mori quàm Deum sibi pœnitentiã pacare, salutemque consequi sempiternam.” Petr. Sic. p. 760.

² “Omnes in unum cogi Manichæos, scorsimque interrogari jussit, atque flammis tradi quotquot essent in errore pertinaces. Itaque... incensi et cremati omnes fuerunt.” *Ibid.*

³ “Cum ab horâ diei primâ usque ad horam nonam multifariã clamarent omnes ut illos à suo errore revocarent, et ipsi ferro duriores resipiscerent... præter unum clericum atque unam monacham cremati sunt. Clericus enim et monacha divino nutu resipuerunt.” Arefaste's Biogr.

⁴ See p. 258.

⁵ See p. 264.

⁶ See p. 266.

with patience, but with joy and gladness: adding, “Answer me, holy Father,” (and Bernard’s solution, if I remember right, shows that he was as unable to account for it as Evervinus,) “how these members of the Devil could with such courage and constancy persist in their heresy, as is scarcely to be found in the most religious of the faith of Christ.”¹

Such is a summary of the *points favourable*, even on the face of hostile historians, to this most remarkable line of Paulikian dissentients, as perpetuated for 500 years in Eastern and Western Roman Christendom. And I confess that when I review the summary,—when I consider the inviolable adherence ascribed to them through that long period to the written Gospels and Epistles, as their one standard of doctrine and duty,—their unimpeachableness of morals,—their continuous protest against all the grosser and more palpable superstitions of the church established,—a protest not by word only, but by separation, as from that which they were to come out of, being apostate,—and kept up with a zeal, endurance, and fortitude, through life and even unto death, that was the astonishment of their enemies,—when I consider further the guarantee that appears against their having been weak and hot-brained *enthusiasts*, both from their so long continued unchangeableness of tenets, (a characteristic never attendant on enthusiasm,) from the admitted learning and wisdom of various of their most eminent teachers, (witness the instances of Sergius² and the Orleanist Canons,) from the simplicity of their adherence to the written word as their

¹ See p. 258—Compare with my argument on this head what Justin Martyr tells us of the impression made on *him* by the early Christians’ ready and fearless suffering of death. Apolog. 2.

² I have already quoted from Petrus Siculus the testimony existing on this point to Sergius, “Audio te, Domine Sergi, literarum scientiâ et eruditione præstantem esse.” With this before him, what are we to think of Bossuet’s version? “Peter of Siculus acquaints us that a Manichæan woman seduced an ignorant layman, called Sergius.” Peter’s subsequent exclamation against him as “stupidissimus, imperitus, and rudis,” because he could not answer the woman’s quotations and inferences from Scripture, as Peter would have done himself (by his own account most incorrectly,)—cannot justify Bossuet. For

rule, not to visions or impressions independent of it, and the general good sense of their conversational reasonings on religious points, even as reported by enemies,¹—I say, when I consider all these things, it seems to me almost inconceivable that they should have been in any *essential* point of faith heretical or erroneous; indeed that they should have been any thing but a line of *faithful witnesses* for Christ's truth and Gospel, taught, commissioned, and sustained, from generation to generation, by Christ's own eternal Spirit. In the history of the world can one single example be adduced of a line of religionists, to whom all these characteristics attached, and who may yet be proved to have been any thing but *God's real servants*?²

Before coming however to any decided conclusion on this most important question, it is necessary that we further consider, as proposed,

II. Idly, THE CHARGES OF HERESY AND ERROR ALLEGED AGAINST THE PAULIKIANS.

And shew the grounds and probable falsehood of them.—Among these there stands out prominently the *general* charge of *Manicheism*; and moreover sundry

this is Peter's mere declamatory abuse of Sergius; the other statement gives us his real reputed character at the time.—Bossuet is a writer on these subjects *always* to be distrusted.

It is to my own mind very remarkable, that in the only two cases in which Paulikian *women* are recorded to have been the instruments of converting men to their sentiments, the persons so converted, viz. Sergius and the Orleanist Canons, should have been precisely those to whose character both for *morality* and *learning*, there exists the strongest testimony.

¹ As an example, I may refer to the Paulikian woman's conversation with Sergius. Indeed *generally*, as regards the reasonings of the sectaries both in the East and in the West, it was confessed that not only the laity, but the clergy, were for the most part unable to answer. So Petrus Siculus confesses, p. 754; and Eckbert at Cologne; &c.

² In regard of *one* important characteristic, Dean Waddington (p. 174) seems to represent the *Priscillianists* of the 4th century as an exception. For he describes them as *Manichean* heretics that yet received the pure inspired Scriptures, and no others. But on turning to the records of the Council of Braga, held A. D. 561, the reader will find that like Ebion, Tatian, Manes, &c, they both corrupted the true, and forged false Scriptures. "Si quis Scripturas quas Priscillianus secundum suum depravavit errorem, vel quæcumque sub nomine prophetarum vel apostolorum suo errori consona confinxerunt, legit, sequitur, aut defendit, Anathema sit." Hard. iii. 349.

lesser and more particular charges of error and heresy, more or less connected with the former, sufficient of themselves, if true, to disqualify the Paulikians, from answering to the figuration of the Apocalyptic Witnesses.

Now as to the general charge of *Manicheism*,—a charge made in the strongest and most unqualified manner against them by opponents alike ancient and modern,¹—I think it well to postpone its full examination and confutation to the *Appendix*:² seeing that it must needs involve a somewhat lengthened sketch of real Manichean doctrine, which would almost be an interruption to the more proper course of our investigations. Suffice it here therefore to give the abstract and result of that examination; which is as follows: viz. that in regard of all the four most important principles of religion,—*first*, its account of the origin of man, and of the mixture of good and evil apparent in the world,—*secondly*, its doctrine on the mode of deliverance from the aforesaid evil,—*thirdly*, man's future prospects beyond death, in case both of those who follow out this plan of deliverance, and those who neglect it,—*fourthly*, the authority on which these its doctrines are propounded, and by which sanctioned,—that in regard of all these four points the doctrines of Manicheism and those of the Paulikians were not only not the same, or similar, but

¹ “If we are not disposed to set up our own conjectures against cotemporary testimony, and to make antiquity bow to our prejudices, we must admit the correctness of the common opinion, and regard the Paulikians as a *Manichæan* sect.” So Mr. Dowling at the conclusion of his Pamphlet. Mr. Maitland's view to the same effect appear in the chapter in his *Facts and Documents* on the Paulikians, p. 83, and his Letter on the Orleanists to Dr. Mill, p. 41. In the first, his statement is thus far qualified: he makes the Paulikians *Manichees to the same extent as the Albigenses*. But that this his qualification amounts to but little, appears from what he says in the second passage referred to, as well as in others that might also be given.

Among the ancient I may specify besides Petrus Siculus, the Patriarch *Photius*, who calls the Paulikian doctrine *Manicheism added to*; and *Anna Comnena*, who designates it as the *unmitigated poison of Manicheism*.

Among later writers Mr. Dowling particularizes besides *Romanists*, the *Protestant* historians Henke, Gieseler, Guericke, Neander in Germany, Mather in France, F. Schmid in Denmark, &c. Differing, he says, in minor points, and not agreed whether the Paulikian errors were of Gnostic or Manichean origin, yet all believe that they held the dualistic opinions, and bore some of the principal features of the early oriental heresies.—*British Magazine* for Oct. 1838.

² Viz. the Appendix to the present Volume.

altogether the most different, indeed directly antagonistic to each other, and incompatible : insomuch that after examination the candid reader will see reason, I am persuaded, not only to exculpate the Paulikian sectaries, but to marvel, I will not say how the charge could ever have been made, (man's enmity against the truth will account for that,) but how it should have been so long believed and perpetuated, as nothing less than one of the most extraordinary mistakes on record in the history of literature.—It would be well indeed if the Romish Church could prove for *itself* as complete a variance from Manicheism. It needs but to consider its *additions* of new apocryphal Scriptures,—its making void of the old by its *traditions*,—its dogma of *purgatory*,—its discipline of *asceticism* and *fasting*,¹—its *invocation of demons*,²—its *Pelagianism* of doctrine,³—and even adoption of *charms* and *amulets* not unlike those of the *Gnostics*,⁴—to see which are the more Manichean of the two, the accused or the accusers,—the Paulikians, or the apostate Churches of Roman Christendom.

To complete the proof however of the purity of the stream of Paulikian doctrine, up to the epoch spoken of, something yet remains. It needs that, besides clearing it of the imputed *Manicheism*, we disprove also its con-

¹ In Augustine's *Contrà Faust.* (Tom. viii. p. 447) Faustus charges on the Catholics their resemblance on this point, even then, to the Manichees.

² See Timothy the Presbyter quoted p. 282 *suprà*; also p. 10 et seq. of this Volume.

³ See Augustine's *Contrà duas Epist. Pelagiani*, ii. 3. &c. where he urges the affinity of spirit between the Pelagian and the Manichee.

⁴ So the portable *crucifixes*, &c. that have had the priest's blessing.—Even the Gnostic *Abraxas*, or *written charms*, had their counterpart in the churches of the Apostacy. I remember seeing on a stone of the theatre at Miletus an affecting example of this. The stone is divided into seven columns : at the head of each column stand the *seven Greek vowels*, each vowel alternately the first : and underneath, in each, the words, " O ye Angels and Archangels, preserve in safety the city of the Milesians ! "—Thus *they* were invoked to save it, not the *Lord* of the Angels. But in vain. Ruins only surround the theatre; and nothing remains to speak to the traveller in the once splendid city of Miletus, but this remembrancer of both the sin and the punishment.—Chandler gives the inscription in his *Inscriptiones Antiquæ*, and notices its Gnostic character.—On the similar permutation of the vowels in the Gnostic *Abraxas*, see Walsh, 49, 51, &c. Also Southey's notice of the *Manicheism* of Romish errors, in his *Book of the Church*, p. 267.

tamination by *other* heresy ; at least heresy on vital points of the Christian faith.

1. Is it true then that they *rejected the Old Testament* ? The circumstance that no such charge was made against Genæsius, surnamed Timothy, in his examination before the Patriarch of Constantinople,¹ detracts of course from its probability. Again, the coincidence of the view of the fall of Adam given in Sergius' epistolary fragment, already cited,² with the account in the Book of Moses indicates any thing but opposition to the authority of *that* part of the *divine record*,—a part specially excepted against by the Manichees. Further we find in the history of their supposed Western descendants that which yet more throws discredit on the charge. For at Orleans, both from the absence of accusation on this point, and from other evidence,³ it may be probably inferred that the sectarian Canons appealed to the Scriptures *generally*, as their rule of doctrine. At *Arras* and at *Cologne* the casual or formal reference for authority to the Old Testament Books,⁴ seems to indicate that these were received by the accused sectaries there, as well as those of the New. At *Lombers*, though the charge is said to have been confessed to by them of rejecting the Old Testament, yet the President's own statement of the matter in his condemnatory sentence,⁵ shews that it was a rejection of it only where unauthenticated by Christ and his Apostles : in other words a rejection of what was apocryphal and spurious, a reception of what Christ authenticates as the *Law, Psalms, and Prophets*, i. e. of the whole Old Testament canonical scripture.—Which being so, and their implicit reception of the *New Testament* almost necessarily involving that of the *Old*,⁶ I cannot but regard this accusation of the earlier Paulikians as most improbable.

¹ See p. 234 *suprà*, and the Tabular View in the Appendix B to this Volume.

² See Note I, p. 271.

³ "Divinorum voluminum exempla." These are said to have been reasoned from by the Canons, and lay probably open before them. See p. 244 *suprà*.

⁴ See pp. 250, 261.

⁵ See p. 267.

⁶ I find the following note in Mr. Dowling, p. 17 : "Milner thinks that the fact that the Paulicians received the writings of St. Paul, is a proof of the soundness of their faith with regard to the Old Testament ; forgetting that the ancient

The truth of the matter seems to me to be as follows :—that themselves for a long time not possessing the sacred Books of the Old Testament, (and the Reader must bear in mind the great difficulty in that age of obtaining them, especially by persons excluded, as they were from the established Church,¹)—that knowing moreover that spurious scriptures were abroad purporting to belong to its canon,²—and hearing, it is probable, false arguments and views on religion and the Church, urged from what really belonged to it, but which from the supercession of the Mosaic law, in respect of its polity and ceremonial, might be of no force under the Gospel,³—I say it seems to me that, under all these circumstances, it became an established habit with the Paulikians (just as indeed with the Waldenses afterwards⁴) to admit of no religious dogma on the asserted authority of the *Old Testament* alone, or except as authorized also by that which is preeminently the Christian code and charter, and which through God's grace they did possess and could refer to,—the Scriptures of the *New*.—As to the charge of rejecting *Peter's Epistles*, it appears in Photius and Cedrenus rather as a *personal* rejection of Peter : and the stigma fixed on the Irish Protestants at this very time by surrounding Romanists, of insulting *Peter*, be-

Manicheans, though they also partially received the New, most certainly rejected the Old Testament." *Partially !!* It was *partially* indeed ! The Gospels and Epistles Manes declared to be corrupted, interpolated, and filled with Jewish fables ; discarded the Acts of the Apostles altogether, and issued another Gospel of his own. So Mosheim. Similarly the Presbyter Timothy, whom I have quoted at p. 282, expresses it, *Ου ταις Κυριακαις γραφαις χρωμενος* " He (Manes) discarded the Scriptures of our Lord." (Hist. Monothel. Col. 452.) Which being so, what becomes of Mr. Dowling's answer to Milner ?

¹ Considering too the prohibition against any but the established clergy reading, and consequently against any possessing the Scriptures. See p. 235 *supra*.

² In the Apostolical Constitutions the Apocryphal Books of Moses, Enoch, Adam, Isaiah, David, Elias, and the three Patriarchs are noticed, among others to be shunned, as Gnostic books, corrupt, and *αντιθετα της αληθειας*.

³ Hence the assertions of the *Levitical* character of the christian priesthood, and propriety in the church of sacrifice, altar, &c., of which I have long since spoken, Vol. i. 261, 262, &c.

⁴ "Quidquid ecclesie doctor docet, quod per textum Novi Testamenti non probat, hoc totum præ fabulis habent." Reinerius, c. 3. B. P. M. xxv. 264. This occurs just after his stating about the same Waldenses, that they had translated and studied both the Old Testament and the New.

cause they reject Peter's successors the *Popes*, furnishes, if I mistake not, a sufficient and true answer.

2. Again, is it to be inferred respecting the *dualistic principle* charged on them, that they held it, though not in a *Manichean*, yet in an *unscriptural* and *heretical* point of view? I have elsewhere observed that the Paulikian peculiarity of doctrine on this head appears to have related not to the original creation, but to the *present constitution* and the *present ruling authority* in the world. The wording of the charge, especially in the Formula of Anathema, in Photius, and in Cedrenus,¹ naturally leads to this conclusion. Witness the use of the word *αιων*, or *age*, to designate that which was the subject of the creation intended; the contrast of this evil creation or constitution of things, not with another *cotemporaneous*, but with that of the *age to come*; and the distinction, connectedly with their statement of belief on this point, between themselves as *Christians* and others as *Romans*;—a distinction evidently not relative to any difference as to the *Creator* that originally made, but as to the *spiritual ruler* obeyed and governing in them.—Supposing this *age* and *state* then to have been viewed by the Paulikians as the theatre and subject of the Evil One's formative agency and domination, was the view scriptural or unscriptural, a heresy or a truth? What read we? Respecting the present *evil constitution* of the world, we read of “the creation being made subject to vanity, and brought into the bondage of corruption, by reason of, or through, him that subjected it;” i. e. I conceive, the *Devil*:² he who tempted man, and so brought death into the world, and all our woes. Again, respecting his *ruling* in this present world,—as *usurper*, not indeed of God's *providential* government, but of that *spiritual kingdom* which of right appertains to the Lord Jesus,—we

¹ See the Tabular view of the anti-Paulikian writers in the Appendix. Mark for example in Photius how he turns from the subject of the *creation* to the *government* of the world.

² *δια τον υποταξαντα* Rom. viii. 20. Some Commentators explain this of *God*, some of *Adam*. It seems to me more according to the sense of the passage, and the analogy of Scripture, to understand it of *the Devil*.

read of his being the Prince and the God of this world,¹ of the whole world lying under the wicked One,² and of the men of this world being those whom he hath blinded, and leadeth captive at his will.³ Further, we read of his declaring to Christ, (and not being contradicted in the assertion,) after shewing Him the kingdoms of the world and their glory, “All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt worship me; for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it:”⁴ and, yet once more, in the Apocalypse, of his raising up, and governing in, the great city, the dominant Roman Empire, both under its earlier Pagan and its later pseudo-Christian form;—in opposition to the kingdom, the so far deprest kingdom,⁵ of Christ Jesus. Thus *scriptural*, I doubt not, were the views held by the Paulikians on the evil Principle and the good,—the present supremacy of the *one*, and future of *the other*.—And yet was there not even in these views something so aliene from the then generally received opinions, as almost necessarily to provoke from men like Petrus Siculus misrepresentation such as the Tabular View exhibits, and the bitter charge of heresy? Listen to Petrus Siculus’ own account of the spiritual state and relation to Christ of the then professing Christian world. He says⁶ that the effect of Christ’s incarnation and crucifixion was such as to have closed hell against all souls piously departing in Christ,” i. e. he means, all dying in communion with the Church Catholic: “such,” he adds, “that the virtue of angelic beings now reigns on earth; that mortals, through their association with the Deity, contend in virtues with the blessed; and that the knowledge of the Lord covers the earth as waters cover the sea.”⁷ In other words he sup-

¹ John xiv. 30, 2 Cor. iv. 4.

² 1 John v. 19.

³ 2 Cor. iv. 4, 2 Tim. ii. 26.

⁴ Matt. iv. 9, Luke iv. 6.

⁵ *Christ’s* witnesses were to prophesy *in sackcloth*; while the Dragon gave to the ten-horned beast, the *Antichrist* on its rising, great authority. Apoc. xiii. 2, &c.

⁶ “Denique animorum apud inferos conclusorum per Christi Dei nostri adventum ea facta est liberatio, uti vastatus, et omnis ille patrum carcer exhaustus, nullas amplius in Christo piè è vitâ excuntes animas posset recipere.” Petr. Sic. B. P. M. p. 755.

⁷ “Magno Deo et Salvatore nostro Jesu Christo in humanis appàrente, omnis

posed Christ's spiritual kingdom to be commensurate with the established church visible, and thus triumphant over that of Satan: a view well accordant with the received interpretation of the Millennium prophecy Apoc. xx, by which the *binding of Satan* was explained to have taken effect on the first promulgation of Christianity, and to be then still in force; ¹ and answering also to the low earthly Romanist view of it held afterwards in the West.²—What then when it was urged against them that in the world or age then existing the *Evil One* was dominant, not the *Heavenly One*; yea dominant in the so called *Church Catholic* itself, as being in fact the predicted Roman Church apostate! What when the *children of the kingdom*, that would at the last be cast out, were by the Paulikian woman and others of the sect declared to mean the members, and very specially the priesthood, of the then professing church;—even as those to whom Christ's heavenly kingdom had been indeed offered, and professedly accepted at baptism, but whom Christ would reject at the last, as having never really belonged to it!³ It is easy to see that this would be doctrine as abominable and strange to the Greeks of the age of Petrus Siculus, as to the Western Romans afterwards; insomuch indeed as readily to provoke against the preachers of it the charge of heresy. Even now, when carried out in clear and personal application, the preacher who urges it is not seldom deemed severe and a bigot. But was it not that which *they* at least *must* have urged, who had to sustain the part of *Christ's witnesses*, according to the Apocalyptic prophecy: when the *heathen*, under the name of *Christians*, had come into Christ's temple; and saying,

idolorum ac dæmonum cultus è medio cessit; Dei autem veri vera cognitio terram omnem instar æquoris inundantis occupavit. Hinc jam cælitum virtus in terris regnat; et cum beatis mentibus mortales, numini familiares facti, virtutibus contendunt." &c. Ib.

¹ An interpretation introduced as early as the beginning of the 5th Century by Augustine: who however, instead of applying the triumph over Satan to the *visible* Church, applied it only to the *Church of the elect*, gathered out of the Church visible. See my Chapter on the Millennium in Part vi.

² Compare what I have said of the origin of such views in my Note 1 p. 129, *suprà*, and Vpl. i. p. 238.

³ See the abstract of the Conversation in p. 235 *suprà*.

“The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are *we*,”¹ occupied, and defiled it?

3. Next, is there reason to suppose that the imputed error really attached to them of *denying Christ's true incarnation and birth* from the Virgin Mary?—To see the *nature* as well as *origin* of this charge, it will, I think, be instructive to look to the examination of Genæsius.² The question was then put simply to him, “Why dost thou not worship and adore the Virgin Mother of God?”³ Here was the *germ* of the future accusation; and which in the time of Petrus Siculus and Photius had been expanded into that which has been already set before the reader: viz. “They reject with hatred the Mother of God always a Virgin; honor her with no place among the blessed; and *speak not of Christ as born of her*, but as having brought down a body with him from heaven.”⁴ Who does not see that the jealousy of the accusers was not for *Christ*, but for the *Virgin Mary*; and that the charge of disbelieving Christ's incarnation was affixed as a mere rider and corollary to that of dishonouring the Virgin Mother of God?—Nor is the charge, even as given, consistent in itself. Let that remarkable clause be observed by the reader which follows immediately on what I have just quoted from Petrus,—a statement twice elsewhere made by him, and also found in Photius; “and that *after the parturition of Christ* she had many sons by Joseph.”⁵ It will need no more, I conceive, to satisfy him that the charge was, as the Paulikians ever contended it was, most unfounded; and that the real point of dispute and difference between them and their accusers of the Greek Church was not this, but the *identity*, or *exact similarity*, of *Christ's human nature* with that of his *Virgin Mother*.

¹ Jer. vii. 4.

² See the Tabular View in the Appendix.

³ “Cur non colis nec adoras Deiparam sanctam?” Petr. Sic. 760.

⁴ See the Tabular View.

⁵ “Et post editum hunc cælestem partum alios ex Josepho liberos à Virgine procreatos mentiuntur.” Petr. Sic. p. 755. So also Photius, ubi sup. p. 205; “Et immaculatam Virginem alios ex Josepho liberos *post partum illum salutarem* peperisse contendunt.” A belief derived, no doubt, from our Lord's *brethren* being spoken of in the Gospels.

—On which point it surely needs but little reflection to see the difficulties which he must plunge into who would be wise above what is written.¹ We know that Christ's human nature was subject to feelings, wants, sufferings, sympathies, like our own. But we know also that it was in one respect *unlike* to ours; it was *without sin*. "He was made in the *likeness* only of *sinful flesh*:"² and whereas "the first man was of the earth earthy, the second man (even in regard of his human soul and nature) was the Lord from heaven."³ In truth the union of these two points seems essential to a right credence respecting the incarnation of our blessed Lord.

Now the perpetual tendency of the Church, from the third century downwards, to aggrandize the Virgin Mary, —a tendency which, notwithstanding Epiphanius' temporary opposition to it,⁴ stopped not short of her *deification*, regarding her as one whom prophecy had delighted in its figures to typify,⁵ and to whom (witness the exemplifications in Petrus Siculus and Photius themselves)⁶ prayer ought to be addressed,—I say this tendency to aggrandize her led to new views, or at least new statements,

¹ e. g. See the revolting speculations given under the name of Ildephonso in the B. P. M. xii. 568; but of which Paschasius Ratbertus (A. D. 850) would seem to be the author. See Dacher. Spicil. i. 43.

² Rom. viii. 3, *ἐν ὁμοιωματι σαρκος αμαρτίας*.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 47. Some manuscripts omit the words, *ὁ Κυριος*, "The Lord."

⁴ See his attack on the Collyridians in the *De Hæres*.

⁵ Besides the well-known and really applicable prophecy in Isaiah, "Behold a Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son," &c, Petrus Siculus, after the general declaration, "quam rem tota lex vetus omnesque vates jam olim manifestis oraculis contestati sunt," particularizes the "porta clausa solique Deo pervia" from Ezek. xlv. 2, the "fons signatus" of Cant. iv. 22, and the "radix Jessæ, cujus de radice virgo et flos ascendet," from Isaiah xi. 1.—The same misapplications of prophecy, and sundry others, may be seen in Hesychius' Homily on the Virgin Mary, Andreas Cretensis in Mariæ Nativitatem, and many others of the Greek Fathers. Hence too in the Roman Office of the Virgin,

Salve radix, salve porta,
Ex quâ mundi lux est orta.

⁶ After speaking of the eternal remembrance of the Emperor Basil and his sons, *Petrus Siculus* adds; "Quod precor ut, *divis* omnibus comprecantibus, Dei mater et semper virgo Maria ratum habeat effectumque reddat." p. 754.—In the same spirit *Photius* supplicates her, as his *refuge* and *propitiation*, to present her adorers free from all taint of sin: *Ἀλλὰ σὺ, ὦ παρθεὶς καὶ μητὴρ τῆς Λογῆς, τὸ ἐμὸν ἱλασηριὸν καὶ προσφυγιὸν, τὸν σὸν υἱὸν καὶ Θεὸν ἡμῶν διαπρεσβενομένη καὶ μαρτυρούσα, τῆς σῆς ὑμνήτας παντὸς ῥύτη καὶ παντὸς ἀποσηξαμένου μόλυσματος, τῆς κρανίᾳ νυμφῶνος ἀξίως ἀναδείξον*. On the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, Bib. P. Vol. IV. col. 1603 (Paris, 1648.)

respecting the great doctrine of the incarnation. The *Nestorian* controversy revealed this in the broad day-light. The Christian world, as it was called, was agitated to its centre with indignation against him, who, preferring a more scriptural phraseology¹ to the phraseology and definitions of man, would call her the *Mother of Christ*, and not the *Mother of God*.² It was not zeal for Christ, or for the right representation of that union in his nature of God and man which was essential to his fulfilling the great character of man's Saviour, that stirred them in the controversy; but, as it has been justly said,³ zeal for the Virgin Mary. The title of *Mother of God* was one that seemed to ascribe more of divinity to her, than that which styled her simply *Mother of Christ*. And Nestorius for preferring the latter was inveighed against first as an *enemy to the Virgin*,⁴ and ultimately as a *Manichean*.⁵—Nor did it end here. At the time of the founding of Paulikianism by Constantine, the *sinlessness* of *Christ's* human soul and nature had begun to be reflected back on that of his *Virgin Mother*. If his human nature were free from sin, how so unless that of the *Virgin, from whom he alone derived it*, was sinless also? Such was the argument of times quickly following; as we find it even yet in writings ascribed to Ildefonso, Archbishop of Toledo, the Paulikian Constantine's contemporary: ⁶—an argument and doctrine which ceased

¹ The proper Scripture phraseology was the *Mother of Jesus*.

² Χριστοτοκος, not Θεοτοκος.

³ "The opinion which Nestorius undertook to protect was at variance with the popular enthusiasm, that had already set in the opposite direction: and it was easily urged on, and roused into a tempest, when an insult was represented to have been offered to the dignity and holiness of the Virgin." Waddington: p. 182. He adds in a note:—"It seems probable that if Nestorius had abstained from all mention of the Virgin Mary, or merely avoided the imprudence of interfering with the title of a being who was already becoming the object of superstition, the controversy would not have taken place at all."

⁴ In Moschi Pratum Spirituale ch. 46 we find, Εγγων αυτον (i. e. Nestorius) ειναι τον της δεσποινας ημετερης αγιας Θεοτοκν τον εχθρον.

⁵ In the supplement to Reinerius in the Bib. P. Max. xxv. 277, the following occurs: "Dicere Christum non doluisse in passione est dicere quod Christus non fuerit homo, nisi phantasma; et hæc hæresis Nestorii et Eutychis." Again; "Est error Manichæi et Nestorii, qui dicunt Christum non fuisse verè passum."

⁶ "Maria Virgo non sic est nata sicut solent pueri et puellæ nasci. Sed de Annâ sterili et patre jam sene, extra consuetudinem mulierum, post refrigerantem calorem et omnem amorum libidinis discessum, mundo corde et corpore ab

not its working in Christendom until the authoritative recognition by Papal decree, in the 15th century, of the freedom of the Virgin Mary from all taint of original sin.¹—All which being so, how could it be but that the Paulikians, if real witnesses for Christ, should bear their protest against the rising error? Their alleged quotation of such texts as, “The second man is the Lord from heaven,” is surely explainable on the hypothesis of their urging them in order to shew that sacred Scripture did not represent Christ’s human soul and nature as *altogether* of the Virgin, or at least of *one* and the *same* character:—an argument however, which, reducing the Virgin as it did to her own real level of one of the fallen children of Adam, might be deemed, and in fact was deemed, little less than blasphemy.—At the same time that their views were not *phantastic*, like those of the earlier Gnostics as well as Manicheans, i. e. that they went not to the *denial* of Christ’s proper *humanity*, will appear from various evidence:—from their “reviling the wooden cross, (so *Cedrenus* accuses them of doing,) as an *accursed instrument*,” or, as *Photius*, “as the *instrument of punishment used by wicked men* ;”² (the same thing that was stated of the Petrobrussians long after, and which would be altogether without meaning unless in the view of Christ’s having really *suffered* on the cross ;³)—from their adoring what *they* called the cross, viz. “*Christ, who with his arms extended formed it*,” an act equally meaningless, except on the same supposition ;

omni pollutione carnali orta est.” In *Nativ. Mariæ*, B. P. M. xii. 590. In his *De Virginitate Mariæ* (p. 566) he thus argues;—“*Si caro ejus (Mariæ) de massâ primæ prævaricatoris venit, quomodo Christus Verbum caro sine peccato fuit, qui de carne peccati carnem assumpsit?*” &c. *Ildefonso* was Bishop from 658 to 677.

I have in a previous Note, p. 296, spoken of *Ratpertus Paschasius* as probably the real author of the Treatise: but the general attribution of it to *Ildefonso* shows that there is nothing in it that was considered contrary to the spirit of *Ildefonso*’s time.

¹ See p. 24 *suprà*.

² See the Tabular View in my Appendix.

³ See p. 256 *suprà*: and compare Peter de Clugny’s statement respecting these Petrobrussians: “*Cùm certum teneatis in morte Christi, quæ per crucem acta est, vitam universorum consistere, dum crucem de medio auferre vultis vitæ omnium invidetis.*” B. P. M. xxii. 1053.

So too *Lucas Tudensis* of the Albigensian and Waldensian heretics of the xiiith century, Book iii. ch. 6; B. P. Max. xxv. p. 212.

from their speaking of their labours, poverty, and suffering as a part of the following of *Christ's* footsteps, as well as of his apostles ;¹ and from their regarding Him as their *forerunner* into the heavenly Jerusalem,² an office which, except as one of real human nature like our own, He could scarce have been supposed to sustain.—On this point then, as on the former, we must acquit the Paulikians of heresy.

4. Once more, (for it needs not that I enter on the charge made against them of *rejecting the worship of the cross*, it being one on the propriety of which all Protestant christians will agree with them,) it remains that we consider whether they were really tainted, as asserted, with heresy on the *sacraments*.—Respecting the *one* sacrament it was said, “They reject the communion of the body and blood of Christ,” or, as Petrus Siculus expresses it, “They deny the divine and awful conversion of the body and blood of Christ from the sacred mysteries, feigning to receive it ; whereas they mean, instead of it, the words of the doctrine of Christ, which he spoke when communicating to the Apostles.”³—Respecting the *other* sacrament it is said, “They express a detestation of baptism, pretending to value it greatly : whereas instead of it they mean Christ ; who, they say, declared, ‘I am the living water.’”⁴—Now that they did not *renounce* the sacraments themselves appears to me probable, both from their repeated disclaimers, and from the recorded fact of their receiving both the one sacrament and the other (at times probably when cut off from their own ministers) at the hands of the priests of the Greek church. For I do not see for what purpose they should have thus availed themselves of their administration, if in either case they had conscientious objections or scruples respecting them.⁵ So in

¹ See Sergius' Letters, Evervinus' Report, &c.

² See Tabular View.

³ See the Tabular View.

⁴ See the Formula of Anathema.

⁵ It is said by Cedrenus that they did so in order the better to deceive. But where the separation was so decided as it was, the Paulikians living very much as a distinct people, it seems as if it would have been a very insufficient method of concealing their own character.

the *East*.—Nor was evidence to the same effect wanting in the history of the probable Paulikian offshoots in *Western Europe*. Let me remind the reader of what is recorded by Evervinus of the *Cologne* heretics, “that besides water-baptism,¹ they had what they called a baptizing with the Holy Ghost, and with fire;” and that “they contended that the elect among them might consecrate the body and blood of Christ at their meals:”²—also of the case of the *Petrobrussians*, among whom the apophthegm was current, “Nulla fides sine baptismo,” as well as “nullus baptismus sine fide:”³—and of that too of the accused of *Lomers*: where the only questioned or suspected point on baptism was not as to the propriety of water-baptism itself, but as to the belief in the efficacy of *pædo-baptism*; and, on the *Lord’s Supper*, as to the place of its consecration, and the persons by whom the consecration was to be performed.⁴

That there was however some prominently marked and constant difference respecting *the sacraments*, between them and the churches established in Greek and Roman Christendom, is plain on the face of the records. For it is noted in every extant account of Paulikian doctrine, from the examination of Genæsius down to the Council at *Lomers*; including the intervening notices of the sect by Petrus Siculus and Photius, and at Orleans, Arras, Vezelai, Cologne, Oxford. And what was it? Respecting the *eucharist* it is scarce possible not to see from Petrus’ wording of the charge, that what the Paulikians objected to and denied was the doctrine of *transubstantiation*; a doctrine already received in the Eastern or Greek Church, as well as the Roman,⁵ though not authoritatively enjoined for some time after: and against which

¹ So too Ermengardus, ap. Facts and Doc. p. 381.

² See p. 267, from Facts and Doc. pp. 346, 347.—Let me here add that what they called the baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire, is said by Evervinus to have been with the *imposition of hands*, and as we read elsewhere, with prayer accompanying.—Compare, on the rite of *imposition of hands*, the *apostolic practice*, described Acts viii. 17, &c. the *Waldensian practice*, and the *English rite of Confirmation*: also on the need of the *Holy Spirit’s influence*, Note 4, p. 302 *infra*, and pp. 259, 260 *suprà*.

³ See p. 255.

⁴ p. 267.

⁵ See p. 155.

the Paulikian protest, begun from early times in the East, was kept up continuously in the West afterwards, even to the time of Petrus Valdensis.¹—As regards *baptism* it is evident that the Paulikians objected and protested against the received doctrine of its efficacy *by itself*, and *ex opere operato*, to the spiritual purification, quickening, and salvation of those to whom it was administered. “They do not believe,” says Photius, “in the efficacy of these things,” (i. e. of the *wooden cross and of baptism*, for he unites the two together,) “to the *justification or cleansing of the soul*.”² The same is the inference from the Paulikian woman’s reprobation of those who were accustomed “with *certain charms*³ to cast out demons, &c. :” a description that is but the counterpart of that which I gave long since⁴ of the baptismal exorcising process introduced into the church before the middle of the 4th century, and which, we see, then still continued. — Against the Orleanists the charge is thus framed by one of the chroniclers ; “They denied the *grace* of baptism :”⁵ by another ; “They denied the *washing away of sins* in baptism.”⁶ At Arras the sectaries are reported to have said, “that there was no sacrament by which *of itself* men might attain salvation.” The Petrobrussians were accused of denying the efficacy of baptism *without faith* :⁷ and those at Oxford, (though

¹ The reader will see this on referring to the historical abstracts already given.

² “Horum vim ad animæ purgationem pervenire non putant.” Photius ubi suprâ B. P. M. 205.

³ “Incantamentis quibusdam.”

⁴ See at Vol. I, p. 256, Bishop Burnet’s and Neander’s representation of the baptismal ceremonies of the apostatizing or apostate Church in the 4th and 16th centuries. They speak of them as viewed and used in the Church at those times in the light of *charms*. It is precisely the same judgment and even phraseology as that of the Paulikian woman.—To which let me add the similar judgment also, as Reiner reports it to us (c. 5), of the *Waldenses* : “Omnes exorcismos baptismi reprobant.”

⁵ John of Fleury. See p. 243.

⁶ “Me nullam in baptismo promereri veniam peccatorum.” Arefaste’s Report in the Chartulary. Compare Rodolphus Glaber’s ; “Omne Christianorum opus, pietatis duntaxat et justitiæ, quod æstimatur pretium remunerationis æternæ, laborem superfluum judicabant esse.”

⁷ So too Eckbert of those at Cologne, &c. See the historical abstracts previously given.—To the same effect is Mariana’s statement, in his account of the Albigensian heresies at the close of the xiith century. “Sacerdotibus remittendi peccata potestatem detrahebant : et, quod majoribus inauditum erat, neque aquam baptismi ad expianda peccata vim habere putabant, neque in eucharistiæ sacramento Christi corpus esse.” Bib. P. Max. xxv. 190.

allowed to have rightly confessed the nature of the heavenly Physician,) yet “of denying those *remedies* where-with,” it was said, “He deigneth to *heal man’s moral infirmity*; i. e. the divine *sacraments* confided to the catholic church.”

Thus the fair inference from all these statements seems to me to be this,—that instead of *heresy* respecting the sacraments, their doctrine was chiefly, if not entirely, a protest against that same *abuse of the sacraments*, against which the Lord himself recorded beforehand *his* protest, if I mistake not, in the memorable prefigurative vision of the 7th of the Apocalypse: it being that substitution of the sacramental *form* for the *spirit*, the *outward* for the *inward*, and the work of the *officiating minister* for that of his own life-giving *Spirit*, which is there allusively noted as the *first symptom* and *cause* of the then *instealing apostacy*.¹ Perhaps as it was the *first*, so it might be considered as of all other errors the *most subtle*, in the apostatic system. Yet, subtle as it was, against *it*, as well as against all the *grosser errors* of the apostacy already noted,² this remarkable line of dissentients were taught and enabled, if my inferences be just, to keep up, through the five centuries comprehended in our review, a faithful testimony.—And what I would further beg the reader to mark, ere passing from the subject, is the fact that they did not merely protest against the unscriptural and false mode of justification and life, but declared the true also. The Paulikian woman, after noticing the exorcising incantations and charms of the Greek priesthood in their ceremonial, expressly reprobated them as a substitution for the *real* source of spiritual life, “the *life-giving and immortal Lord*.”³ The ministers of the Paulikians recognized the *divine Spirit’s* influence as the one grand qualification for the ministry.⁴ At Arras the here-

¹ See my Vol. i. pp. 248, 257.

² See p. 272, & *suprà*.

³ “Relicto Domino vivente et immortalis.” Compare this with the passage in Apoc. vii: the “*vivente*” with “having the seal of the *living* or *life-giving* God;” &c. See Vol. i. p. 213.

⁴ Compare what is said of the disputes between the two sons of Paul of Epiphanius, and afterwards between Zacharias and Joseph, as to which of the two had

ties, speaking of the *sacraments* as that which *of themselves* could not purify, are stated to have also set forth, in the way of contrast, “*a certain justification*,”¹ whereby men *might* be cleansed and purified. The Petrobrussians, when protesting against the saving efficacy of baptism *without* faith, implied its saving efficacy *with* faith. The Cologne declaration, “that fastings and penances are not necessary as undertaken for sin,” was followed by another statement, “because that at what time soever the sinner repents of his sins they are all forgiven.”—From all this it seems to me that I am warranted in concluding that the cardinal truth of *justification from sin* by Christ’s free grace through faith, (though not indeed in the clear *forensic* view of the phrase,) and with life and salvation imparted by Him as its accompaniment, was from the beginning, and throughout, the doctrine of the Paulikian sectaries; in opposition to the doctrine, embraced and taught in apostate Christendom, of justification and life through the *opus operatum* of the *sacraments*.

I conclude my long argument respecting these Paulikians with an observation which, on the whole review of the matter, strikes me very forcibly. It was stated by St. John in his Epistles, as a general characteristic of the heresies which had up to that time appeared, that they were all in character *anti-christian*; “Even now there are many *Antichrists*.” The true meaning of which word *anti-christian* denotes, as before shown, rather *that which usurps the place of Christ*,² than that which is *against Christ*; though the latter sense must of course apply to all that is anti-christian in the former. Now it will only need to look with attention on the grand heresies that are recorded in ecclesiastical history, to see that this is a characteristic essentially attaching to them all. Whether it be the Gnostic or the Manichean, the

been called by the Holy Spirit to the chief ministerial office in the Paulikian body. “Cum iste divinam Spiritus gratiam accepisse se assereret, ille contrà de se ipso idem affirmaret.” Petr. Sic. B. P. M. 760, 761.

¹ “Quandam justitiam præferentes.” See Note 1 p. 249 and Note 2 p. 250 *suprà*.

² See my Vol. i. pp. 67, 68.

Arian or the great Greek and Roman apostacy,—in every case Christ will be found to have been practically set aside by the heretical system, in respect of his chief offices, and something substituted in his place. It was Satan's grand object. On the other hand there appears in the record of the Paulikian asserted heresies, albeit given by enemies, a marked and constant tendency to Christ, not *from* Christ. "They denied baptism," is one of the charges made, "professing to value it; but meaning *Christ*, of whom it was said, I am the living water." They denied the eucharist, "feigning to receive it, but meaning *Christ's doctrine*." "They reviled the cross, pretending to honor it; but meaning thereby *Christ crucified*, who with his arms extended formed it."¹ Again they called themselves the *body of Christ*,² implying that He was their *chief* and their *head*: and spoke of Christ as Him whose footsteps they wished to follow in this world,³ Him who was their *forerunner* to the heavenly Jerusalem, and as their *King* marked them from his mediatorial throne in heaven.⁴ Once more, as the great object of their hopes, they looked, as we have before seen, to his introduction of *the age to come*; in which age the usurper should no more have authority, but all the power and all the authority be with the Lord Christ.

Was not all this precisely according to the character I have ascribed to them of *Christ's Witnesses*?

In the mean while in this world their feeling was that of *exiles* or *pilgrims*. They saluted each other, (and the appellation seems to me beautifully significant,) as *συνεκδημοι*, *fellow-pilgrims*, or *fellow-exiles*.⁵ For they were not of

¹ See generally my Tabular view in the Appendix; also Note 3 p. 298.

² See the fourth Extract from Sergius' Letter, given p. 271 *suprà*: and the account of the Cologne heretics, p. 259; also Eckbert, quoted in Facts and Documents, p. 355, and St. Bernard, Sermon 66 de Cant. &c.

³ So in Sergius' Letters, and in the enquiry at Cologne.

⁴ So at Orleans.—Perhaps I might have added, as their *Melchisedek* and *High Priest*. See p. 282.

⁵ The *ministers* were styled *συνεκδημοι*; implying *εκδημοι*, *exiles* or *pilgrims*, as the designation of the members of the sect generally. At p. 239 I have just noticed this appellation, and also passages in the Acts and in St. Paul's Epistles in which the word, simple or compounded with *συν*, occurs. In two of them, Acts xxi. 29 and 2 Cor. viii. 19, it is used *literally* of those who were absentees, while travelling with the apostle from *earthly* homes. In 2 Cor. v. 6, we find it

the world, even as Christ was not of the world. Though resting for comfort whilst on this earth on the God of peace, the realization of his presence, and hope in his exceeding great and precious promises,¹ yet their *home* was in the *world to come*.—And thus it was that the world hated them; and shewed its hate, not only by other persecutions,—persecutions too generally even unto blood,—but by blasphemies such as we have been inquiring into; and which not we only, but even the more candid of their enemies, have adjudged to be false.²—Let us however remember that one result followed which was little foreseen or intended. These blasphemies were but

used *spiritually of absence from the Lord*; “When at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord:” *ενδημνυτες εν τω σωματι εκδημμεν απο τω Κυριου*. In the next verses St. Paul dwells on the idea; “We walk by faith, not by sight: and we are willing rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord:” *εκδημησαι απο τω σωματος, και ενδημησαι προς τον Κυριον*. It must have been in this latter sense that the appellative was meant by the Paulikians; as it was not given alone to a *few* specially sent out from the body as missionaries, so as in 2 Cor. viii. 19, but to the ministers generally.—It appears from Petrus Siculus’ narrative that some of Sergius’ *συνεκδημοι* were still living at Tephric on his visiting it.

Let me here observe that I think we have in this word the true explanation of the meaning of one of the appellatives by which the Paulikians were known in Western Europe, and on which there has been various conjecturing:—I mean *Passagini*, or *Passagii*. Mr. Maitland, (Facts and Doc. p. 449) after noticing the unsatisfactoriness of previous explanations, suggests that the name accrued to them from the connexion of some of their body with the *passagia* or *crusades*;—they having joined the returning pilgrims and soldiers. But in the first place this would be a title quite *indistinctive*; in the next we have *no authority* for it. Again Dr. Gilly in his *Waldens. Researches*, p. 61 explains the word as *inhabitants of the passes*. But the term attached to them when they were not so located. On the other hand the explanation of the term as meaning *Pilgrims*, in the spiritual sense of the word, would be but the translation of their recognized Greek appellation *εκδημοι*, and a title as distinctive as beautiful.—(*Ducange*, I may observe, gives the word without any explanation.)

¹ See the last of the Epistolary Fragments of Sergius given by Petrus Siculus, and of which a translation is appended at the commencement of this Section, p. 271: also the account of the sectaries at Orleans, p. 245.

² *Popliniere*, about A. D. 1581, on the ground of the *Acts of a Disputation* then extant between a Romish Bishop and the Albigenses, and also of certain ancient Tablets engraved with an Albigensian Confession of Faith at Albi, asserts that their tenets resembled those of the Protestants of his time.

Fignier, a cotemporary of *Popliniere*, and Historiographer Royal of France, on the authority of one of their Confessions, written in the Basque language, and presented to the Chancelier de l’Hôpital, affirms that there was no trace of Manicheism in them; that the tenets professed were like those of the Waldenses; that they received the *Old Testament* as well as the *New*, rejecting every thing that was not founded on them; and that on *this* account they condemned the ceremonies, traditions, and ordinances of the Romish Church; saying that she was the Harlot of the Apocalypse.

Serranus, another learned and cotemporary French Author, though condemning them strongly for their separation from Rome, yet declares that he had seen

an additional badge of their being really what we suppose them to have been. The sacred and unerring word of prophecy declared both generally that Christ's witnesses would have to prophesy *in sackcloth*; and specifically, as one cause of the sackcloth-robing, that the wild Beast from the sea and the abyss would open his mouth in *blasphemies* against them: ¹—it being their appointed honour, in this as in other respects, to tread not only in their fellow-disciples', ² but, as they most desired, in their Master's own footsteps. ³ So that in fact it completed in them the prefigured characteristics of the Witnesses.—And following as it does on all that mass of favorable evidence that we have extracted from hostile records,—the only records now extant of them,—it enables us to conclude, with yet the more confidence, that they were indeed according to the tenor of the Apocalyptic prefiguration, *a line of true WITNESSES for the LORD JESUS.*

§ 6.—EPOCH AND ORIGIN OF PETER WALDO AND THE WALDENSES.

Who has not heard of the WALDENSES?—It is with reference to them that the history and epoch of the Lyon-

an ancient manuscript that gave reasons for their separation, just similar to those that had been revived afterwards by Wicliff and Luther.

So too *Paradin* and *Gerard*; the former ascribing the charges made against them to the malice of their enemies, whose vices they exposed.

These authorities are given by Usher De Success. and Basnage; and have been lately copied from them by Faber, King, &c. ¹ Apoc. xiii. 6.

² To similar blasphemies against the *early Christians* I have already alluded, pp. 278, 281: to which let me add, that on a coin of Diocletian there is exhibited to the eye the fact of the charge having been made against *them* of worshipping the Serpent,—one form of the *Gnostic* God; i. e. according to Dr. Walsh's explanation.

Also of the blasphemies against the *Waldenses* I have spoken there and p. 616. Afterwards charges precisely similar were made against the *Wicliffites* and *Hussites*. In the Council of Constance the following questions for examination are pointed against them: (Hard. viii. 915.)

“Utrum credat quoddam contemnens ritus ecclesiæ, cærimonias exorcismi, (et) aquæ *baptismatis* consecratæ, peccet mortaliter.

Utrum credat quoddam Christianus contemnens sacramenta confirmationis, vel extremæ unctionis, aut solemnizationis *matrimonii*, peccet mortaliter.”

Thus it was insinuated against the Hussites and Wicliffites that they too were opposed to the sacraments of *baptism* and *marriage*.

³ So Matt. x. 25; “If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more those of the household!” &c.

nese merchant, generally known under the name of *Peter Waldo*, (a name incorrect, however, as will soon appear,) has become almost more notable than even (eminent as he was among Christ's witnesses) on his own account. For about the year 1170, having sold all he had and distributed to the poor, he became head to certain missionary bands known thenceforward under the name of *Waldenses*, as well as *Poor men of Lyons*, that soon drew on themselves the public attention and persecution in various countries of Western Europe; and from before the middle of the next century became known as sectaries that had an intimate local connexion with the *Alpine vallies of Piedmont and Dauphiny*. And the question has long been agitated, as one of the most interesting in the history of the middle age, whence and when the first origin of these sectaries; it being allowed on all hands that they had no *Eastern or Paulikian* original. By the Romanists, and many Protestants too, it has been contended that it was from *Peter Waldo* that they derived their beginning and appellation; and that as to the Alpine vallies of Piedmont, their habitation in them dates but from the xiiith century:—while on the contrary others assert that their origin was of far higher antiquity: that they were a sect of separatists who, having retired to those Alpine vallies on the first development of the corruptions of the Church of Rome, had there ever after kept alive through successive ages the lamp of Christian truth: and that as to the appellation of *Valdenses*, it was but a corruption, or metonymy, for *Vallenses, Men of the Vallies*; Peter Waldo having derived his name from them, not they from him.—The controversy, which in past ages exercised the master-minds of *Bossuet* on the one side and *Flacius Illyricus* and *Archbishop Usher* on the other,¹ has in our own times and our own country been revived by *Mr. Maitland* and *Messrs. Faber and Gilly*.² As an Apocalyptic commentator, I have

¹ See Bossuet's *Hist. des Variations*, Flacius Illyricus' *Catalogus Testium*, and Usher de Success.

² See Maitland's *Facts and Documents*, also his smaller controversial Pamphlets; Faber's *Sacred Calendar*, and *Book on the Albigenses and Waldenses*;

felt myself obliged not to pass lightly over the investigation. And this remains my impression, after careful consideration of the evidence and arguments on either side,—that there exists highly probable proof, proof alike documentary and from testimony, altogether independent and irrespective of such prior historical evidence as I have been detailing in my three or four previous Sections, to the fact of Waldensian Sectaries having existed in Alpine or sub-Alpine settlements, whether in the vallies of Piedmont, Dauphiny, or Switzerland,¹ considerably before the time of Peter Waldo; in so much as to render it likely that he was rather named from them, than they from him. And connecting this with the historical evidence, previously given by me, I infer as probable, not indeed a secession of the sectaries to Alpine vallies before the æra of the great Gothic invasions, but one coeval, or nearly so, with the time of Claude the Protestant Bishop of Turin.—I proceed to state the proof.

And under this head let me unfold the argument from *Peter Waldo's real name and appellation*;—that from *the constant tradition*, as reported to us, of the *later Waldenses*;—that from *the partial admissions of their hostile chroniclers*;—and that from *certain ancient Waldensian documents still extant*.

1. As to the *name* of the devout Lyonnese merchant, it is curious that either side in the controversy, acquiescing in the correctness of the name as usually written in modern times, *Peter Waldo*, should have argued from it as making in their favour. Thus Beza: “He

and Gilly's Waldensian Researches.—Let me add that many ministers of the Vaudois have taken their part in the controversy. So Leger and Gilles in former times; and M. Muston, the latest Waldensian writer on the subject, still living.

¹ The vallies of Dauphiny and Piedmont were connected from early times by the great road of Mount Genevre, which is called by Ammianus Marcellinus (Lib. xv.) “*media, compendiaria, magisque celebris*,” by comparison with the two other Alpine roads connecting the South of France and Italy. See Gilly's Wald. Researches, pp. 49—60; who notes the early Councils at Arles, Milan, &c. on either side the Cottian Alps; the attendant Bishops at which from the other side must probably have crossed by Mount Genevre; and also suggests that in yet earlier times it was probably *Irenæus'* road from Lyons to Rome.—The road from Geneva into Piedmont was traversed by Charlemagne,

was named *Valdo* because he was one of the most eminent of the *Vaudois*.”¹ And so too Faber in his *Sacred Calendar*.² On the other hand Mr. Maitland replies somewhat characteristically; “I believe that Peter of Lyons was called Waldo *because that was his name*; and for no other reason whatever:”—adding; “Why were other people called Waldo?” and appending, by way of corroboration, in prominent capitals, a list of nine bishops, abbots, &c., of the same name, from documents of the middle ages.³ Which point so settled, the corollary would follow with more appearance of reason, that the Waldensian sectaries, that acquiesced afterwards in his sentiments, derived their name from him.

I confess that when I read this in Mr. Maitland, it approved itself to my mind as the dictate of good common sense; and so doubtless it has done to many other readers of the *Facts and Documents*. On looking however into the earliest and best authorities, I found, what I think should have been noted more prominently than it has been, that in not one of them is the Lyonnese merchant called by the name of *Waldo*; but either *Valdes*, *Valdesius*, *Valdensis*, or *Waldius*:⁴—the three

¹ “Jean (i. q. alii *Petrus*) de Lyons a été ainsi surnommé (*Valdo*) parce qu’il étoit des premiers entre les *Vaudois*.” Quoted in Leger, Part i. p. 16.

² *Sacr. Cal.* iii. 20. (2nd Ed.) ³ *Facts and Doc.* pp. 107, 108.

⁴ *Walter Mapes*, writing of sectaries he had seen at Rome in the year 1179, (the reported year of Peter Valdes’ death,) says; “*Valdesios* à Primate eorum *Valde* dictos, qui fuerat civis Lugduni super Rhodanum.”—*Peter of Vaux Sernai*, the eye-witness and historian of the Albigensian Crusade, writing about the year 1218, as Maitland infers from his *History* ending at that year, speaks of them as “*Hæretici* qui Waldenses dicebantur à quodam *Waldio*, cive Lugdunensi:” and so too *Alanus*, his cotemporary; “*Qui Waldius* dicebatur.”—*Moneta*, who wrote a *Summa contra Catharos* about the year 1240, observes; “Non multum temporis est quod esse cœperunt: quoniam, sicut patet, à *Valdesio*, cive Lugdunensi, exordium acceperunt; qui hanc viam inceptit non sunt plures quàm octaginta anni.” And so too, some ninety years later, *Guido the Carmelite* in his *Summa de Hæres*. “*Secta Waldensium* inceptit circà ann. 1170. Fuit *Valdesius* civis Lugdunensis, qui divitias reliquit ut pauper fieret, et Christum sequeretur,” &c.*—Once more, *Stephanus de Borbone*, or *Bella Villa*,—a man who had conversed, as he tells us, with one of the translators of the Bible employed by Peter of Lyons,—in his work *De Sept. Donis Spir. Sancti*, (Tit. vii. c. 31,) calls him *Waldensis*: “*Amicus fratrum nostrorum qui dictus fuit Ber-*

* *Harduin*, vi. ii. 1692.—His date is given in the *Index Auctorum* appended to *Ducange*; “*Guido de Perpiniano, Carmelita, Episcopus Elcensis, vixit circà ann. 1330.*”

former evidently distinct appellatives from *Waldo*; and not even the last explainable, I believe, as its tantamount *Latin* rendering.¹—And this is further observable, that the three first names are used, in the same or earlier records, each one to signify a *Waldensian sectary*.² Which being so, not only does Mr. Maitland's theory fall to the ground, as to the derivation of the name of these sectaries from the merchant of Lyons, (for how could *Valdensis*, in the sense of *Valdensian* as a *patronymic*, be derived from *Valdensis*, *Valdes* or *Vaudes* from *Valdes*, *Valdesius* from *Valdesius*, the *derivative* from a *primitive* identical with itself? ³) but the presumption is almost forced on the mind that he may have been himself probably so called as being a *Waldensian sectary*, and thus in his very name have exhibited evidence of the existence of these sectaries prior to him.—I admit indeed that the appellation, even though allowed not to be *personal*, need not necessarily to have been a *sectarian* designation. It might very possibly have attached to him, (indeed such is the bearing of the reports of some of the old writers,) as

nardus Ydros, cùm esset juvenis et scriptor, scripsit dicto *Waldensi* libros," &c. By which name he is also designated by *Pilichdorf*, at the close of the fourteenth century, and by *Claude Scyssel*, Archbishop of Turin, of the fifteenth; "*Valdensis*, ut aiunt, appellabatur." Muston, 152, 154.

I have specified the dates of these various writers; because on controverted points like that under discussion, the value of the testimony is of course very mainly affected by date; and it will be useful as we proceed, and make other citations, for the reader to revert to this notice.

¹ In all the *Latin* documents in which I have seen the name, it stands simply *Waldo*; just as *Hugo*, *Guido*, *Otho*, and other names of the same termination: and not in the nominative case only, but also in the oblique cases. So *Dacher*. i. 431, 601; "Atto Domino *Valdoni*, reverendo Episcopo:"—" *Valdonis* abbatis." Can Mr. Maitland show a single one of all his nine *WALDOS* to have been called *Valdes*, *Valdesius*, *Valdensis*, or even *Waldius*?

² That *Valdesius*, as well as *Valdensis*, was a *sectarian* appellative, appears from the above-cited passage from *Walter Mapes*:—that *Valdes* was so, appears from its being the original Romance of which *Valdesius* is but the Latinized form; as also from that notable line in the *Noble Lesson*, of which I shall have to speak again more fully,

lh dion qu'es *Vaudes*, e degne de punir. Line 372.

³ Among all the multitude of heretics that ecclesiastical writers recite to us, I can only remember *one* in which the original author and the disciples had the same appellation: the exception I allude to being that of *Manes*, who was called also *Manichæus*, the general designative of a *Manichæan* sectary. But in this case the derivative *Manichæus* was as usual formed from *Manes*: and *Manes'* own name was afterwards changed by his disciples into that of the derivative *Manichæus*, in order to avoid the *δυσφήμια* of his proper name, which signified in Greek *a madman*. So *Augustine* informs us, in his *Lib. de Hæres.* c. 46:

a *provincial* or *local*, rather than as a *religious*, appellative.¹ And it deserves observation, although *these writers* do not at all satisfactorily explain or define the locality, that *Valdensis* (and consequently *Valdes*, its equivalent in the Gaulik Romance, as also the Latin of Valdes, *Valdesius*) was all through the middle ages just such a *local* appellative: inasmuch as it answered to that of *Vaudois* now;² I mean as designating an inhabitant of the *Pays de Vaud*, in Switzerland.³ To which let me add that, —supposing the *valley of the Drome*, on which *Die* (the ancient *Dia*) in Dauphiny is situated, to have taken for

“Manichæi à quodam Persâ extiterunt qui vocabatur *Mames*: quamvis et ipsum *Manichæum* discipuli ejus appellare maluerunt, devitantes nomen insanîæ.” He notes the same thing in two or three other passages.

¹ So Pilichdorf; “In civitate *Valden*, quæ in finibus Franciæ sita est, fuit quidam civis,” &c:—Masson, Pref. to Alanus contrâ Waldenses; “Natus in vico qui dictus est *Vaudra*.”—the Magdeburgh Centuriators; “*Valdenses* ab oppido *Vallis*, sito in Marchiâ Galliæ, unde erat oriundus:” and an anonymous Inquisitor, quoted by Alix; “*Pauperes de Lugduno*, quos vulgus *Valdenses* appellat dictos à *Valde* cive Lugdunensi, in loco dicto *Val Grant* moram faciente.” (Faber on Wald. 453, 520).

² So in a Diploma of A. D. 886, in which Charles the Fat gives to Adelgise, Vassal of the Margrave Rodolph, “quasdam res proprietatis suæ in pago *Valdensi*.” Again a Charter of the date 1192 has, “Comes Genevensium et *Valdensium*.”—and on the year 1224 we read of the Chevalier d’Hauterive as in the “*Comitatu Valdensi*,” for the *Comté de Vaud*. I copy from Muller’s History of Switzerland, French Edit. i. 289, ii. 81, iii. 93. In another historical document that he gives, of date earlier than 800, if I remember right, there is also mention of “*Valdensium* usque mare Rhodani.”

Let me add that the same Valley of the Rhone higher up bore the name of *Vallesia*, hodiè *Le Vallais*, and its capital, Sion, that of *Sedunum Vallesia*. Thus the *Valdenses* and *Vallesii* were in juxtâ-position.—The *Valesii*, however, of the Papal excommunication quoted by Faber in his Appendix, p. 595, and about whom he requests inquiry, were evidently a very different people; being heretics known by that name among the *Greeks*, and not of the most reputable character; the same of whom *Reiner* speaks, Bib. P. Max. xxv. 272.

³ Since the above was written, I have seen in *Muston* (pp. 82, 113) a notice of this *local* derivation of the *sectarian* appellative *Valdensis*, as one suggested by Mr. Sharon Turner; but which *Muston* considers undeserving serious regard. His statement, however, that the *Vaul* (or *Vald*) in the *Pays de Vaud* is derived not from *vallis*, but from the Celtic *Wale*,—the Germans designating *Gauls* by the name of *Wale*, and the *Pays de Vaul* by that of *Welsch-land*,—even if correct* is no argument at all against the etymology; and he offers no other. Rather, since it appears from his book, p. 381, that a colony of *Waldensian religionists*, that still exist and preserve their Alpine patois in Wurtemberg, bear the name among their German neighbours of *Welches*,—the identity of phrase in *German*, as well as *French*, to designate alike the *sectarian Vaulois* and the *Paysan de Vaul*, favours the suggested derivation.

* *Leger*, on the contrary, derives the name from *Vallis*; “Le Païs s’appelle *Païs de Vaux* parceque c’est un tissu de collines et vallons.” i. 17.—On either supposition Mr. Maitland’s question recurs, “Whence the *d*?” For the name is not *Pays de Vaux*, but *Vaud*.

a certain space the name, as was often elsewhere the case, of that its chief town,—then a resident there too might have been named, as from the *Vale of Die*, *Valdiensis*, *Valdensis*, or *Valdius*.¹ Thus, I say, might either of these two localities,—each adjacent to the *boundary Marches* of Gaul, specified by the chroniclers,²—have given the appellative to Peter Valdes, if a resident. Besides them I know no other locality that would.³ But even supposing the word to have been thus originally a *local* appellative, the circumstance of remarkable religious movements having occurred in each of these very localities just before Peter's time, might then well have caused the *local* appellative to be a *religious* appellative also; just like that of *Albigensis* and others, soon afterwards. For it is to be remembered (let me just for one moment look back to notice it) that *Peter de Bruys* ministered previously in the one district,—that of *Die* in *Dauphiny*; and *Henry*, the successor of Peter de Bruys, at *Lausanne* in the other: so as in both the one case and the other to have connected a *Valdensic* locality with religious innovation and sectarianism.—Thus does the Lyonnese merchant's appellative of *Valdensis*, *Valdes*, or *Valdesius*, although not decisive of it, yet certainly favor the hypothesis of a sect of Waldensian principles having existed in the sub-Alpine districts of which we speak, prior to Peter Valdes.

2. To the same effect is the *constantly asserted tradition of the later Waldenses*, as reported to us by the

¹ *Deensis*, or *Diensis*, is the constant adjectival designation of the Bishops of *Dia* or *Die* in the middle age. *Dius* might also be formed from *Dia*, I presume, as *Macedonius* from *Macedonia*.

² I allude to the "*Valden in finibus Francia*," and "*Valdis in Marchiâ Gallia*." See Note 1, p. 311.—Let me also observe, with reference to another report of the locality, from whence Peter derived the name Valdes, "*in Val Grant moram faciente*," that it may be explained on either of the above-mentioned hypotheses. If by *Val Grant* be meant the *Great Valley*, then the *Valais*, or High Valley of the Rhone, observed on in a former Note, offers the most natural explanation;—if a village or town of that name, then *Faugrand*, a village or locality that still bears the appellation between Valence and Die.

³ Unless indeed Mr. Townshend's solution be preferred, which makes the *Waldenses* to be the descendants of the *Garuldenses*. See p. 214 Note 2 *suprà*. I must confess however that on inquiry evidence seems wanting, such as to give probability to this theory.

Romish writers against the sect.—Thus *Moneta* reports the assertion of certain of his followers, that Peter Valdes received ministerial orders from the collective body of his brethren :¹ and how could he have received orders, or appointment to teach, from disciples formed by his own teaching?—Again *Reinerius*, the famous Inquisitor who wrote very soon after *Moneta*, (his date being about A. D. 1250,) thus states the tradition in the 4th chapter of his Treatise on Heresies.² “Of all heretical sects that are or have been, none is more pernicious than that of the *Leonists* : first from its superior antiquity ; for some say” (some evidently of the Leonist Waldenses themselves) “that it has lasted from the time of Sylvester, others from that of the apostles.”—A century after, or somewhat more, *Pilichdorf* thus repeats the tradition : “The sons of iniquity say falsely, before simple men, that their sect has endured from the time of Pope Sylvester, when the church began to have possessions.”³—About the year 1500 *Claude Scyssel*, Archbishop of Turin, writes ; “Some of the heretics pretend that the sect has lasted from the times of Constantine the Great ; and that under one Leo, execrating the avarice of the then Pope Sylvester, they made the choice to live by themselves in simplicity and seclusion : also that they who thought rightly of religion adhering to him, there had been transmitted from them the rule of apos-

¹ “Quidam dixerunt quòd Valdesius ordinem habuit ab universitate fratrum suorum. Eorum autem qui hoc dixerunt principalis auctor fuit quidam hæresiarcha Pauperum Lombardorum.” *Moneta* vi. 4. apud *Muston* i. 12.

² *Bib. P. Max.* xxv. 264. This Chapter of *Reinerius* is given, together with other copious extracts, by Mr. Maitland in his Appendix to the Facts and Doc.

³ See *Pilichdorf's* Treatise in the *Bib. P. Max.* xxv. 278.

With regard to the date that I have assigned to *Pilichdorf's* Treatise, it is given in the Treatise itself, Ch. 30. “Jam, sicut scribitur Anno Domini mcccxcv, mille centi sexaginta duo anni, vel circiter, elapsi postquam Christum passus est pro nobis.” *B. P. M.* 295.—It is strange, this being the case, that with *Pilichdorf's* Treatise before him, Mr. Faber should have expressed doubt as to its real date ; assigned it, notwithstanding *Bossuet's* different date, to the xiiith not the xivth Century, on the meagre authority of the incorrect chronological Table prefixed to the Bibliotheca ; and indeed reasoned on the thence inferred nearness of *Pilichdorf* to Peter Valdes' time. See *Faber's* *Waldenses* pp. 275, 304.—Even independent of the particular chronological statement that I have quoted, the subject of *Pilichdorf's* 31st Chapter fixes the date of the work to the latter half of the xivth Century. For its subject is the Jubilean Pilgrimage each 50th year to Rome. And the first example of this *bicentenary* jubilee was in the year 1350.

tolie life to the present time.”¹—To Œcolampadius Vaudois sectaries, then living, declared in 1530 that they had endured as a little people for more than 400 years,—yea, from the time of the apostles.² In the Treaties of the Waldenses with the Savoy Government, Muston declares³ that they asserted (and here the tradition has reference to the time of their inhabiting the Alpine Vallies of Piedmont) that they were possessors of the Vallies before Savoy held Piedmont ; i. e. I believe, before the middle of the 12th Century.⁴ Again, in one of the later Waldensian manuscripts delivered to Morland in 1658, and which must therefore have borne date before (perhaps much before) that year,—to the question, “How long have the Valdenses inhabited the vallies ?” the answer returned is, “On the *actual authority of many histories*, about 500 years ; but according to *our belief* from the time of the Apostles.”⁵—Thus we see that from no very long time after Peter Valdes’ epoch, and ever after, instead of referring their origin as a sectarian or religious community to *him*, the Waldensian sectaries are declared to have dated it back to the remote antiquity of Pope Sylvester I, or even of the apostles : also that in the 15th and 16th centuries they asserted the further fact,—and appealed for its truth to historical authorities then existing,—of their *inhabitation of the Piedmontese vallies* as a sect of separatists as early, or thereabouts, as the year 1100.

3. Nor, let me add, are there wanting admissions, though partial and self-contradictory, in the *hostile chroniclers* themselves to the antiquity of the Waldenses ; at least to their antiquity before Peter of Lyons.—Thus Conrad of Lichtenau, Abbot of Ursperg in the diocese of Augsburg, states in his Chronicle, under the year 1212, that he had in that year seen some of the *Poor*

¹ Gilly’s Waldenses 78, Faber 282.

² Muston 409.

³ *Ib.* p. 351.

⁴ So too the Waldenses, if I may thus call them, of the Alpine Vallies of Dauphiny, in their Memorial to the French King Francis I, in the year 1542. See Muston 350, Faber 288, 433.

⁵ Leger, Part i. ch. 26, from one of the lost Cambridge Manuscripts.

men of Lyons at Rome :¹ and observes respecting the sect they belonged to, that, “having arisen some considerable time before (olim) in *Italy*,” (not *Lyons* or *France*, be it observed,) “the sect still continued :” thus obviously implying that the origin of the sect was not from Peter of Lyons.—The same is the testimony of the writer of the *Tractatus* in *Martene*.² “The sect is divided into two parts ; the *Ultramontane* or *Gallic Pauperes*, and the *Lombard Pauperes* : and of these the former descended from the latter.”—So too *Reinerius*. Although he had said before that the *Leonistæ*, or *Poor men of Lyons*, had their origin from the *Lyonnese merchant*, Peter Valdes, yet he presently after speaks of the sect as being formidable from its *superior antiquity* to other sects then existing ; viz. the *Manichæans*, *Arians*, and *Runcarians*.³ And though by the *Manichæans &c.*, it is pretty clear that he meant the *novi Manichæi*,⁴ that had made themselves conspicuous in comparatively modern times in Western Christendom, yet it is scarce

¹ Mr. Maitland gives the extract from Conrad at p. 398 of his *Facts and Documents* ; but ascribes the notice of having seen the *Lyonnese Pauperes* at Rome not to Conrad himself, though speaking of it in the first person, but to some anonymous writer quoted by him. His reason is that he supposes the transaction described to have taken place at Rome under Pope *Lucius III.*, in the year 1183 ; a time when Conrad would probably have been too young to be present. But there is nothing whatever in the extract from the *Chronicle* to fix it to that date. On the contrary it represents the time of the transaction as near that of the institution of the *Dominican* and *Franciscan* orders ; which latter event was in the 4th *Lateran Council* under *Innocent III.*, in the year 1215. See *Hard.* vii. 83. The “*vidimus tunc temporis*,” evidently refers not to the time of *Lucius’ Decree* but to the year 1212 noted in his *Chronicle*.—The correctness of this view of the matter is confirmed by the statement in the *Tractatus de Hæresi Pauperum de Lugduno*, given from *Martene’s Anecdotes*, by Maitland, at p. 468 of the same Volume ; it being there said expressly that it was to *Innocent III.* that the *Lyonnese Poor Men* made their application.—Conrad’s *Chronicle* concludes at the year 1229. *Moreri* says that he died in 1240.

² See on the authorship of this Tract Maitland’s Remarks in answer to King, p. 45. *Martene*, from whose collection it is taken, ascribes it to *Stephen de Bourbonne*, the same writer that I have already quoted : *Semler*, on the authority of *D’Argentrè*, to *Iconetus*, a writer who lived a century and half, I believe, after *Stephen* : *Muston* (p. 127) to the *Summa De Cath. et Leon.* of *Reinerius*. In this uncertainty as to the date of its author, I have prefixed the extract to that from *Reinerius*.

³ Ch. 4 of his Tract on Heresies. “*Sectæ hæreticorum fuerunt plures quam lxx : quæ omnes per Dei gratiam deletæ sunt, præter sectas Manichæorum, Arianorum, Runcarianum, et Leonistarum, quæ Alemaniam infecerunt. Inter omnes has sectas non est perniciosior ecclesiæ quàm Leonistarum. Et hoc tribus de causis. Prima quia est diuturnior.*” *Bib. P. Max.* xxv. p. 264.

⁴ See Maitland against King.

credible but that, inquisitor as he was, and a brother of the Dominican order, he must have known from the anti-Albigensian writings so famous of St. Bernard, from sundry Chronicles of the preceding age, and from the Acts of the Councils of Orleans, Arras, Charroux, Rheims, Oxford &c, particularized in a preceding Section, that heretics had been condemned as Manichæans in the xith and first half of the xiith century. Hence his statement, even though thus understood and limited, must be regarded as referring back the origin of the sect at least to the commencement of the xith Century.¹—Once more I must not omit the later testimony of *Rorengo*, Prior of St. Roch in Turin about 1640 : who being commissioned to enquire into the history and antiquity of the Waldenses of the Alps adjacent, reported that they were not a new sect in the ixth and xth Centuries, and that Claude of Turin must have detached them from the Romish Church in the ixth.² For we can scarcely doubt but that many old Documents of authority on the subject existed in the Ducal Archives ;³ and, if so, that Rorengo, whose work was dedicated to the Duke of Savoy, had access to them. So that, though a late one, his testimony is important.—Let me again observe, however, respecting these various testimonies, that what they witness to is chiefly the *antiquity* of the sect ; and in so far as *locality* is concerned, only to its having originated in *Lombardy* before appearing at *Lyons*. As to its location in the *Piedmontese Alpine Vallies* before the xiiiith Century they furnish no testimony.—It has been said indeed that one Ebrard of Bethune partly furnishes it ; inasmuch as about the year 1212 he wrote of their calling themselves *Vallenses*.⁴ But he was a writer far dis-

¹ Having no *exact* knowledge as to the time of Petrus of Lyons, he may possibly have supposed this statement not inconsistent with the former.

² Morland p. 13, &c.

³ Leger informs us how the Records and Books of the Waldenses were sought out by their enemies, in the crusades against them, and carried away to Turin. He was himself spoiled in this way of all his manuscripts and books in the massacre of 1655, and saved nothing but a Bible.—See Leger i. 4 ; also Gilly's Wald. Res. p. 79, &c. and the extract from *Morland* in the Note next but two following.

⁴ This occurs in his 25th chapter, (B. P. Max. xxiv. 1572) headed “*Contrà eos qui dicuntur Xabatati* ;” a well-known appellative, from some peculiarity in

tant from the scene, and evidently not well acquainted with the subject. The date usually assigned him of 1212 is more than doubtful :¹ and the appellation professedly applied by him figuratively.

4. Next comes the argument (an argument that will detain us somewhat longer) from certain of the *Waldensian Documents* still extant.²—The manuscripts, as

their shoes or sandals, of the disciples of Peter Valdes. In it he says ; “ *Vallenses* se appellant eo quòd in valle lachrymarum maneant : ” and again, “ *Omnia ista vobis obijciuntur à Salomone O Vallenses.* ”—He *elsewhere* uses the word *Waldenses*, apparently of *other* heretics : evincing in his description that he knew but little about them.—Bernard of Fontcaud’s pun on the word *Vallenses*, “ *quasi à valle densâ* ” the dark vale of error, (Bib. P. Max. xxiv. 1585,) will not much help the hypothesis.

¹ Mr. Maitland says, Facts and Doc. p. 99 ; “ I believe the only authority on the point is the distich following, respecting a certain *Grammarians* of the same name and place ;

Anno milleno centeno bis duodeno,
Condedit Ebrardus Græcismum Bethuniensis.”

And he argues that the *bis* refers to the *duodeno*, not the *centeno*, making the date 1124, not 1212 ; so proving what might otherwise have been suspected, that the *Grammarians* was a different person from the anti-Waldensian writer.—That Mr. M. is correct in his construction of the *bis* will appear from the two following versicular dates of similar character, quoted by Waddington, p. 380, from Pagi :—the first respecting the foundation of the *Cistercian* order, A.D. 1098 ;

Anno milleno centeno bis minus uno,
Pontifice Urbano, Francorum rege Philippo,
Sub Patre Roberto cæpit Cistercius ordo :

—the second respecting the *Præmonstratensian* order, under Norbert, a friend of Pope Innocent II, who died A. D. 1144 ;

Anno milleno centeno bis quoque deno
Sub Patre Norberto Præmonstratensis viget ordo.

² The account of his collecting them, as given by *Sir J. Morland*, is too illustrative of the subject, as well as too interesting, to omit. “ Some days,” he says, “ before my setting out for Savoy,” (i. e. as ambassador from Cromwell about the year A. D. 1650) “ the late Lord Primate of Ireland, Archbishop Usher, sent for me to his chamber ; and there gave me a serious charge to use my uttermost diligence in the enquiry after, and to spare no cost in the purchase of, all those manuscripts and authentic pieces, which might give any light into the ancient doctrine and discipline of those (the Waldensian) Churches :—adding there was nothing he was more impatient to know, as being a point of exceeding moment for stopping the mouths of our Popish adversaries, and discovering the footsteps of our religion in the dark intervals of the 8th, 9th, and 10th centuries. This serious injunction of that reverend and worthy man, together with my own real inclination, caused me to leave no stone unturned, nor to lose any opportunity, during my abode in those parts for the effecting this thing. And although the Pope’s emissaries had already gathered the more choice clusters and ripe fruits, yet I met at least with the grape-gleanings of the vintage ;—I mean divers pieces of antiquity, some whereof had been a long time buried under dust and rubbish, others had been scattered about in the vallies, some here, some there, in desert and obscure places, and without a singular providence had never come to light.” *Waldensian Researches*, p. 136.

is well known, were collected in the Piedmontese vallies by Sir S. Morland, ambassador from Cromwell in 1650 to Savoy ; by him brought to England ; and in August 1658 (so Morland himself states) deposited in the Cambridge University Library. They were then bound in 21 volumes ; but of these the seven first are now missing.¹ Of some however of the missing Treatises copies remain in the works of Morland and Leger : and of the most valuable of all, *the Noble Lesson*, there exists an ancient manuscript copy in the Library of Geneva ;² though less ancient, it is supposed, than that of Morland.³

It is with the *Noble Lesson* alone that I have to do for the present.—Objections have been made by Maitland, after Bossuet, to the assigned *dates* and even *genuineness* of other of the manuscripts ; more especially of one entitled a *Confession of Faith*, and another a *Treatise on Antichrist*.⁴ And so far as regards the *dates* assigned by *Morland's collector*,⁵ or by *previous copyists* of the manuscripts, his objections have weight ; though not so as to affect the genuineness of the documents. For the dates do not appear to have been in any case (excepting the *Noble Lesson*) a component part of the work ; and they might well have been added,—incorrectly added,

¹ Inquiry having been made as to the time and manner of the loss, no account it seems can be given. All that is known is that Allix, who published his work on the Waldenses in 1689 or 1690, speaks of having seen, and quotes from, one of the missing and now not extant volumes ; also that a catalogue of the Library made in 1753, mentions only the 14 volumes yet remaining, numbered from H. to W. The necessary conclusion is that between the years 1690 and 1753 these seven volumes were abstracted ;—how, or by whom, is a matter of conjecture. Wald. Res. pp. 154, 447.

² Both Gilly and Muston give *fac-similes* of the six first lines of the Poem, as written in the Geneva Manuscript.—The Poem itself will be found in my Appendix.

³ So *Raynouard*, the learned author of the *Poesies des Troubadours* ; Vol. ii. p. 142. “Je suis porté à croire que le manuscrit de Cambridge avoit été fait sur un exemplaire plus ancien que celui de Geneve.” ap. Muston 146.

⁴ Facts and Doc. p. 114, and Second Answer to King, p. 55.—Has Mr. Maitland fully considered the difficulty of a successful forgery of the antique ? The case of Chatterton is a memorable modern example of its being no easy matter of execution.

⁵ “It” (*The Confession of Faith*) “was packed with sundry other Documents, including the *Treatise on Antichrist*, in one parcel ; to the *envelope* of which the *Collector* had affixed the general date of 1120.—I do not suppose there was any intentional imposition on the part of him who affixed the date : but the action must be viewed as arbitrary, and altogether unauthoritative.” Faber, 370, 372.

by the *collector* or *copyist*, and other alterations introduced also,—without affecting the genuineness of the original manuscript. Is the Treatise of Pilichdorf a forgery, because its Editors, publishing it in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, falsely assign it the date of the xiiith century? ¹ Or the Canons of the Council of Tours, held A. D. 1163, because “the word *Albigenses* (a name not used so early) occurs in the title of the Canons?” ² On this Mr. Maitland simply argues; “It was probably prefixed at a later period:”—and so we all explain the subsequent and generally incorrect *subscriptions* appended early to many of Canonical Epistles. Why then reason differently on similar incorrectnesses in the manuscript copies of these Waldensian documents?

But, as I said, it is alone with the *Noble Lesson* that I am concerned at present. And certainly if ever there were document that might be said to bear on its face the stamp of genuineness, such seems to me the case here. For there is a spirit of primitive simplicity and piety breathing all through it,³ that forbids the idea of fraud or forgery; and also an absence of point and fulness on the subject of Romish vices and errors, such as, had it been forged to make out the case of the Waldenses as witnesses against Rome, we might surely have expected.⁴—Besides which there are certain more purely *literary criteria* by which it may be tested; and on all of which, having been tried, it has well stood the test. The reader must understand that it is in rhythmical verse; somewhat like the Provençal Romances of the Troubadours; and that the date of 1100 years from the epoch when it was said, “We are in the last times,” is incorporated into the very verse itself, and as a part of the Poem:

¹ See Note 3, p. 313.

² Mr. Maitland's words. *Facts and Doc.* p. 138.

³ “L'esprit de ce Poeme est tout-à-fait celui d'un age simple et reculé, d'un peuple nourri sans altération de la pure doctrine primitive.” Muston, p. 146. He quotes also *Neander* writing of “le calme et l'onction avec la quelle ce Traité est écrit.” *Ib.* 144.

⁴ So M'Crie: “The *Nobla Leycon*, and other religious Poems of the Vaudois, which are among the earliest and the rarest of Provençal poetry, contain few of those *satirical* reflections on the Clergy, which abound in the writings of their cotemporaries who remained in the Romish Church.” *Reform.* in Italy, p. 15.

Ben ha mil e cent anez compli entierament
Que fo scripta lora car sen al derier temp.

i. e. “ Well have a thousand and a hundred years been fully accomplished, since it was written that we are in the last times.” Now the date thus announced must needs be somewhere between A. D. 1100 and 1200. (I shall presently recur to the subject in order to infer the epoch more exactly.) And thus it is open to the critic to investigate the accordance of the Poem with that professed date, in respect of *language, versification, &c.*, as well as of *sentiment and historical fact.* This has been done by *M. Raynouard*, author of the work on the Poetry of the Troubadours; a man confessedly well qualified for the undertaking.¹ And his report is, that after having accurately examined into the dialect, style, form of verse, agreement and disagreement of the Cambridge and Geneva Manuscripts,² &c,—he can on every account, and without reserve, affirm the genuineness of the document, and its freedom from interpolation.³ Mr. Hallam, our own eminent living author, after reference to Raynouard, expresses his entire agreement with him; observing that “any doubts as to the authenticity of the Poem are totally unreasonable.”⁴

But what the more exact date of the Poem? Whence its 1100 years to be computed?—Both Gilly, Faber, Muston, and many others, agree in regarding it as tantamount to the year 1100 of the Christian æra; and

¹ “An indisputably competent judge,” says Mr. Hallam.

² *Choix des Poésies Originales des Troubadours*; Vol. ii. Pref. p. cxxxvii.—cxliii. “J’ai conféré,” he says, “le texte du Manuscrit de Geneve avec celui du Manuscrit de Cambridge publié par S. Morland. Les successeurs des anciens Vaudois, ni les dissidens de l’Eglise Romaine, qui auraient voulu s’autoriser des opinions contenues dans ce Poeme, n’auraient eu aucun interêt à faire des changemens; et s’ils avaient osé en faire, ces changemens auraient bien moins porté sur la date du Poeme que sur le fond des matières qu’il traite, pour les accommoder à leurs propres systèmes dogmatiques. Enfin le style même de l’ouvrage, la forme des vers, la concordance des deux manuscrits, le genre des variantes qu’ils présentent, tout se réunit en faveur de l’authenticité de ces poésies.”

³ “Les personnes qui l’examineront avec attention jugeront que le Manuscrit n’a pas été interpolé.” *Ibid.*

⁴ *Middle Ages*, i. 37, 38.—I am not sure whether Mr. Maitland himself would brand the *Noble Lesson* as a forgery.

even M. Raynouard fixes it at A. D. 1100, or *thereabouts*.¹ To myself however it seems almost imperative to calculate the 1100 years, according to the more strict and literal meaning of the clause, *from the time when those words were written*, “ We are in the last times : ” i. e. from the date of St. John’s first Epistle, where, and where alone, the passage referred to occurs.² And as the composer of the Noble Lesson, though unendowed with the

¹ Mr. Faber, in corroboration of this view, directs attention to what is said in the context, of the world being then near its conclusion. “ The world is near its end. The world approaches its termination.” And again; “ Daily we see the signs coming to their accomplishment, in the increase of evil and the decrease of good. These are the perils that St. Paul mentions; so that no man who lives can know the end.” Also at the conclusion; “ Many signs and wonders shall be wrought from this time forward to the day of judgment,” &c. Agreeable with which, he says, was the expectation, begun long before, A. D. 1000, (see Vol. i. p. 440,) but partially revived in 1100, that the end of the world was at hand. In illustration he cites from William of Malmsbury (ii. 34) the following legend of Edward the Confessor’s vision of the seven sleepers, seen shortly before his death, A. D. 1066, and from whence the prognostication was drawn that in seventy-four years the end would come.

“ Stupenda, inquit, vidi. Septem dormientes in cæli monte requiescere, jam ducentis annis in dextro jacentes latere, sed tunc ipsâ horâ visûs sui latus invertisse sinistrum. Futurum ut septuaginta quatuor annis ita jaceant, dirum mortalibus omen. Nam omnia ventura in his 74 annis quæ Dominus circâ finem mundi prædixit discipulis suis:—gentem contrâ gentem surrecturam,” &c.

And various other prognostications to the same effect might be added. Thus in Michel’s *Théâtre François au Moyen Age*, lately published at Paris, p. 3, the earliest Piece given is the very curious Sacred Drama, if I may so call it, of *Les Vierges Sages et les Vierges Folles*; a Piece ascribed by the learned Editor to the 11th century, and which seems to have been got up for acting at church, in place, or in aid, of a sermon. Preceding it in the old manuscript are some detached *Latin Canticles*, to which a notice at the head of the Manuscript ascribes the same date; “ Varii Cantus scripti xi sæculo.” Among them occurs the following:

Senescente mundano filio,
Quem fovebat mentis oblivio,
Venit Sponsus, Divina Ratio;
Comes ejus Restauratio.
Apta Comes replet palatia:
Aulam Sponsus entrat per (h) ostia.

I may also exemplify in the prediction of a Florentine Bishop, to the effect that in the year 1105 Antichrist would be born. Op. Bernardi, i. p. 846. (Paris, 1839).

² “ Little children, it is the last time. And as ye have heard that Antichrist cometh, even now there are many Antichrists; whereby we know that this is the last time.” ii. 18.—Some have suggested the alternative of dating the 1100 years from the writing of the Acts, or of St. Peter’s first Epistles, because of the days then present being there spoken of as the last days: e. g. Acts ii. 17, “ It shall come to pass in the last days; ” and 1 Peter i. 20, “ Christ was manifested in these last days.” But really the suggestion scarce deserves consideration. The quotation in the Noble Lesson is evidently the above passage from St. John; and it is again referred to at the close of the Poem: “ We ought to be well advised when Antichrist shall come; but according to Scripture there are many Antichrists.”

critical accuracy and learning of modern scholars,¹ must yet, on the more general and obvious evidence of Scripture history, have seen reason to date the Epistle some 20, 40, or 50 years after Christ's death, it follows that he must have regarded the 1100 years, measured therefrom, as elapsed *somewhere between* A. D. 1150 and 1180.—That the earlier of these dates would well consist with the exprest expectation in the Noble Lesson of the world's speedy ending, will appear from a statement in a letter of St. Bernard, written in the year 1128, that it had just then been the subject of serious conversation between himself and one Norbert, a man of much eminence in Bernard's judgment; and that it was Norbert's full and solemn conviction that before the generation then living past away, Antichrist would be revealed, and the last affliction of the church begin.² At the same time, as individuals are found to have exprest a similar expectation half a century afterwards,³ we cannot conclude at all confidently on this ground against the later date.—So that the indefiniteness of some 30 years, earlier or later, must still be allowed to attach to the self-ascribed date of the Poem.

And it is curious that pretty much the same measure of chronological indefiniteness should attach to the criteria of other characteristic notices in the Noble Lesson

¹ Michaelis dates St. John's 1st Epistle A. D. 70, Lardner, A. D. 80, Mill and Le Clerc about 91, Beausobre, L'Enfant, and Dupin at the end of the first century. The larger number of Commentators agree most with Michaelis; considering that there is evidence in the Epistle of having been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and thus A. D. 68, 69, or 70. So Grotius, Whitby, Macknight, A. Clarke, Horne, &c.

² "Verum de Antichristo cum inquirerem quid sentiret (Norbertus),—durante adhuc ea quæ nunc est generatione revelandum illum esse se certissimè scire protestatus est; . . . et non visurum se mortem nisi prius videat generalem in ecclesiâ persecutionem." Bernard adds that he was himself not convinced by Norbert's reasons. "Cum eandem certitudinem unde haberet sciscitanti mihi exponere vellet, audito quod respondit, non me illud pro certo credere debere putavi." Ep. 56. And it will be well to remember that there was certainly then no such *general* expectation as that which existed at the commencement of the preceding century.

It will be observed that Norbert's prognostication agreed well with Edward the Confessor's: as the seventy-four years, specified in the vision seen by the latter, would end only in 1140.

³ For example about A. D. 1200 the Abbot Joachim of Calabria prophesied that within sixty years Antichrist would appear. So the Benedictine Commentator on Bernard's Works, Vol. i. p. 846.

respecting both the *Vaudois* addressed in it, and the surrounding *Romanists*, which are yet, both chronologically and otherwise, deserving of observation.—Thus the word *Vaudes* is mentioned in it as a sectarian appellative then in use: and the first known notice of it in other history is that by Walter Mapes at *Rome* in 1179;¹ a notice almost implying a previous use of it, at least some few years earlier, on its native soil.—Again we find it implied of the *persecutions* of the *Vaudois*, that they were at the time when the poem was written very much limited to *unjust exactions* on the general body,² and *imprisonment*, and other persecutions *short of death*, on such of them as might act as ministers and missionaries:³ a representation which could scarce have been made after the third Lateran Council in 1179, and Pope Lucius III in 1183, had issued their decrees, (decrees obligatory throughout Western Christendom,) denouncing the one the terrible ecclesiastical *Anathema*, the other *capital punishment*, against all pertinacious heretics:⁴ but which, alike in any of *our thirty doubtful years* before the Lateran

¹ See p. 309 *suprà*.

² “They say that such an one (who will not lie, swear, defraud, &c.) is a *Vaudes*, and worthy of punishment (*digne de punir*); and they find occasion, through lies and deceit, to take from him that which he has gotten by his just labour.”—In Leger’s copy the reading is *morir*, for *punir*; “worthy of death,” instead of “worthy of punishment.” It seems plain that this must have been the alteration of a copyist after the sentence of capital punishment had been promulgated and enforced. The *context* shows *punir* to be the original reading.*

³ “They persecute and imprison the good.—These greatly wish to show the way of Jesus Christ; but they are so persecuted, that they can do only little.”—Again; “They suffer not good people to keep God’s commandments; but rather hinder according to their power.”

⁴ See *Hard*. vi. ii. 1683, 1878. They are also given in the *Facts and Doc.* p. 175, 176, 496.—“We lay under a perpetual Anathema the Cathari, Patarini, and those who falsely call themselves *Humiliati*, or *Poor Men of Lyons*, &c.” So the *Lucian Decree* begins: and it then adjudges that these and their abettors, if pertinacious, should be *given up to the secular power*, i. e. for execution; and their goods confiscated to the Church. It is stated, at the head of the Decree, that it was issued with the sanction of the Emperor Frederick, and of a Council of Patriarchs, Archbishops, &c., assembled from various parts of the world.—After this, anti-heretical decrees multiplied, and specifically against the heretics called *Vaudois*. In 1192 the *Wadois* were ordered to be seized, chained, and brought up for punishment in the diocese of Treves: “De hæreticis qui vocantur *Wadoys* omnibus fidelibus præcipimus, ut quicumque eos invenerint vinculis

* From the transcript of the *Noble Lesson* now given in the Appendix, from the Geneva copy, it will be seen that this my conjecture is right. [2nd. Ed.]

Council, may well have been true, from the previous comparative independence of the local authorities, and their power to legislate and act as they thought fit, whether more leniently or more severely, against heretics.¹—Further there occurs an incidental notice in the Poem of the then Vaudois creed respecting *Antichrist*; ² shewing that at that time the sect thought of him as an *individual*, and expected his coming as still *future*: whereas about the opening of the 13th century, it had come to be an article of the Vaudois creed that the Papacy and Church of Rome were to be regarded as the Apocalyptic Harlot, Babylon, and Antichrist,³ and so continued unalterably ever afterwards.—Lastly we find a notice in the Poem

astriectos teneant, et ad sedem Tullensem puniendos adducant.” Statuta Synod. of Odo, Bishop of *Tours*, copied by Muston, p. 161, from Martene’s *Thesaur. Anecdot.* iv. 1182. In 1194 there was issued the expatriating Decree of Ildephonso, king of Arragon, against the *Waldenses*, &c; then others.

How little the language of the Noble Lesson on this head would suit the state of things a few years afterwards, will appear from what was said in a Council of Narbonne, held A. D. 1235: “What stranger even is there who knows not of the condemnation of heretics and *Waldenses* for many years past; so justly executed, so notorious, so public, so preached about, and so firmly sealed by the death of so many unbelievers, solemnly condemned, and publicly executed!”—Harduin vii. 257.

¹ This independence in the local authorities is marked in all the proceedings against heretics, from A. D. 1022 to 1165, narrated in my 4th preceding Section.—In almost all of these the spirit and action was that of extreme severity. However in the case of Henry the Petrobrussian, we had an example of imprisonment as the punishment inflicted. (See p. 258 *suprà*.) This was in 1147. Also in the case of Peter of Lyons himself and his earlier followers the persecution was one not unto death.

² See the quotation at the end of Note 2 p. 321.

³ This appears at least as early as the year 1207. There was then a public disputation held at Carcassone between what were called *Albigenses* on the one side, (including however *Vaudois* sectaries settled near Albi,*) and *Romanists* on the other: the former being represented by Arnold, probably a friend of Peter Valdes; † the latter by Dominic and the Spanish Bishop of Oxuma. And one of the Theses asserted and defended by Arnold, was that Rome was Babylon and the Harlot of the Apocalypse; symbols interpreted, I believe, by all previous prophetic expositors as prefigurations of Antichrist. About 1250 *Reiner*, to the same effect, notes among the Waldensian heresies that of holding the Roman Church to be the Harlot of the Apocalypse, and the Pope the head of all errors.—At length, and perhaps not very long after *Reiner*’s Work, there was written the Vaudois *Treatise on Antichrist*, in the which the doctrine was, as we shall see hereafter, most strongly and fully asserted.—Leger (i. p. 156) from Thuanus,

* So Maitland, *Facts and Doc.* p. 96: “The children of these settlers were strictly speaking both *Albigenses* and *Waldenses*; the one by nation, the other by sect: and in the indiscriminate attack made by the Crusaders against heresy, these were confounded with the rest.”

† See Faber, p. 510. Dr. Gilly agrees.

respecting *the neighbouring Romanists*, which represents them as at that time in the habit of deferring their *confession* to the priest *until their death-bed* : ¹ a habit that could not have existed after the promulgation of the decrees of Pope Innocent and the 4th Lateran Council, A. D. 1215 ; wherein *annual* confession, at the least, was enjoined on every individual, on pain of exclusion from the Church both in life and death,² with all its fearful consequences.

Thus while these various notices exhibit a precise accordance with its self-ascribed date, as written somewhere within 20 or 30 years before A. D. 1180, and thus furnish us with strong corroborative evidence of the *genuineness of the Poem*,—yet, as regards the question of the *priority* of the Poem, and of the community addressed in it, to *Peter of Lyons*,—comprehending as our 30 doubtful years do the whole period of his ministrations,—they are, like the date itself, inconclusive. Nor, I may add, are certain *phraseological peculiarities*, that have been adduced by others for the purpose of fixing the exact date,³ at all more decisive on the point in question.

represents Peter Valdes himself as at once thus preaching against Rome and the Papacy. This, if correct, must have been at an advanced period of his career.

Let me just add, with reference to the disputation at Carcassone, that, though it occurred after the Papal Decrees of 1179 and 1183, yet the lords of the district still asserted independence, and even protected the heretics. The *immediate* consequence was the freedom of the discussion ; but the *next* that Dominic, foiled in his arguments and object, reported at Rome the contumacy of the Albigensian nobles : whence followed the Albigensian Crusade with all its horrors, and at length the destruction of the Counts of Thoulouse.

¹ “ When his mortal malady comes, when death seizes on him, then he calls for the priest, and wishes to confess himself. But according to the Scripture he has delayed too long. For it commands and says, that thou shouldest confess while in sound health, and not wait till the last.”

² Canon xxi ; “ All of either sex, arrived at years of discretion, shall faithfully confess all their sins in private to the priest, receiving the Sacrament of the Eucharist reverentially, at least at Easter, unless it shall appear to his own priest that there is sufficient reason to the contrary ; on pain of exclusion from the Church while they live, and from Christian burial when they die.” Hard. vii. 35.

In the Council of Toulouse, held A. D. 1129, just after the Inquisition on the heresies there diffused by Peter de Bruys, it was ordained that there should be confession *three* times a year. But this was but a private Council, and only partially and temporarily operative. That of Lateran was of universal authority ; and its operation enforced by the then recently organized Inquisition, and sundry local Councils.

³ I allude to Mr. Faber’s argument from the use of the words *Jews* and *Saracens* for *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and of *Cavaliers* for *Roman Officers*, in the following passages : “ Ma ço troben que l’Escriptura di, Mot fort perseguien *Jusios* e

There is however, I think, in the *dialect* of the Noble Lesson, evidence strongly indicative of the *distinctness* of the community that spoke it from the Poor Men of Lyons, and which we may perhaps follow up by other evidence showing their *priority*.—Respecting the *dialect* of the Noble Lesson, it is to be understood that it was not that of the Lyonnese merchant and the followers that he gathered round him. Of these the language spoken and written was, of course, the vulgar *Romance* or *Gaulik of Lyons* and its neighbourhood. Accordingly we have historic testimony to the fact that it was in this dialect that Peter had the Bible translated. *Walter Mapes* tells us that he saw at Rome in the year 1179 Valdesians, so called from their chief Valdes, who presented to the Pope a book, containing the Psalter and other books of the Old and New Testaments, written in the *Gaulik* tongue.¹ Again, *Stephen of Borbonne*, who had his information from one of the priests employed by Peter in translating, says that the translation was in the *Rosaracins* ;” But we find what the Scripture says, that the Jews and Gentiles (Saracens) persecuted them grievously : and “ Un de Cavalier vene e li ubere la costa : ” One of the *Cavaliers* came and pierced his side. He speaks of both the one expression and the other, as evidence in favor of the early date of A. D. 1100 ; pp. 395, 398.

A reader however at all versed in history must be aware that the *Saracens* were pre-eminently *Paynims*, or *Pagans*, in the minds of crusading Christendom, just as much in the time of Richard Cœur de Lion and Saladin, as of Godfrey of Bouillon. And as to the conjunction of their name and that of the Jews, as under a similar opprobrium, it occurs frequently as late, and later than, the close of the xiith century : as, for example, in the heading of the xxvith Canon of the 3rd Lateran Council ; “ Ne Christiani habitent cùm Judæis vel Saracenis.” Just after which the phrase “ in more *Paganorum* ” occurs, with evident reference to the Saracens.

With regard to the use of the word *Cavalier*, a precisely similar use of it will be found in the *Fragment du Mystere* on the Resurrection ; a piece given in Michel’s Theatre Francais au Moyen Age, already cited ; and the date of which is fixed on decisive evidence to be as late as the end of the xiith, or beginning of the xiiith century. In the versified Preface to this very curious Piece, the dramatic Personæ, scenic paintings, and arrangements to be followed in the acting, are described. Among others there occur the verses following ; (p. 11 :)

Primes Pilate od ces vassals
Sis u set *chivaliers* aura.

Afterwards one of the *chevaliers* is represented as piercing Christ’s side. (p. 14.)

¹ “ Vidimus in Concilio Romano sub Alexandro Papâ III celebrato (A. D. 1179) Valdesios, homines idiotas illiteratos, a Primate ipsorum Valde dictos, qui fuerat civis Lugduni super Rhodanum ; qui Librum Domino Papæ præsentaverunt linguâ conscriptum *Galicâ*, in quo textus et glossa Psalterii plurimorumque Legis utriusque librorum contincbatur.” Quoted by Faber from Usher De Eccles. Successione ; c. viii. § 12.

mance, or *vulgar Gaulik*.¹ In addition to which we learn from other testimony, that this translation in *Romance* was some few years after published and circulated at *Metz*, showing that it was the Romance *there* spoken :² that it was there preached against by the Abbots ; there burnt, together with other translated works of the same Waldensian sectaries ; and so, together with the Waldenses who had published them, extirpated.³—On the other hand the language of the *Noble Lesson* is, as M. Raynouard assures us,⁴ not only not the *Lyonnese*

¹ Le Long thus writes, from Echard's *Sancti Thomæ Summa*, p. 540 :—“Stephanus de Borbonne, or de Bella Villa, a Dominican who died in 1260, describing the origin of the Valdenses in his book, *De Septem Donis Spiritûs Sancti*, says ; The sect began in this manner, according to what I have heard from many persons who had seen the earlier members of it, and from that Priest Bernardus Idros, held in much respect, and rich in the city of Lyons, and a friend of our Order ;—who when he was young, and a scribe, wrote the earlier Books, which they possessed, for the said Waldensis in the Provençal language (in *Romano*) for money, from the dictation of a certain grammarian called Stephanus de Ansa :—he (Valdensis) having made an agreement with the said Priests, that the one should translate into the vulgar tongue, and the other write what he dictated.” Quoted in the *Facts and Doc.* p. 128.—In my Note 3 p. 19 *suprà*, I have already alluded to this translation.

Muston, p. 154, giving an extract from the above in the original Latin, supplies an omission of Le Long ; “Stephanus de Ansa *quem ego sæpe vidi*.” He also adds from it the following ; “Similiter multos libros Bibliæ, et auctoritates Sanctorum per titulos congregatas, quas *Sententias* appellabant.”

² “Tertia causa (propagationis Waldensium) est Veteris ac Novi Testamenti in *vulgarem linguam* ab ipsis facta translatio ; quæ quidem edita est in urbe *Metensi*. Unde Innocentius III mandavit Episcopo et Capitulo *Metensi*, ut diligenter inquirerent quis fuerit auctor ejusdem translationis, quæ intentio transferentis, &c ; ut constat ex Libro Secundo ejus *Epistolarum*.” Richinii *Dissert de Valdensibus* ; prefixed to Moneta's *De Valdensium Progressu*.

Pope Innocent's Letter, referred to by Richinius, (Ep. 141,) deserves remark. It is addressed, “Ad universos Christianos tam in Urbe *Metensi* quam ejus Diocæsi constitutos,” A. D. 1199 ; and contains the following passage. “Significavit nobis venerandus frater noster *Metensis* Episcopus per literas suas quod tam in Diocæsi quam urbe *Metensi* laicorum et mulierum multitudine non modica, tracta quodammodo desiderio Scripturarum, Evangelia, Epistolæ Pauli, Psalterium, Moralia Jobi, et plures alios libros, sibi fecit in *Gallico* sermone transferri.”—The permission of having books of the Bible in the vulgar tongue was soon altogether interdicted. So in the 4th Council of Lateran, that of Toulouse, &c.

³ In Alberic's Chronicle on the year 1200, is the following : “In urbe *Metensi* pullulante sectâ quæ dicitur *Valdensium*, directi sunt quidam Abbates ad prædicandum : qui quosdam libros de Latino in *Romanum* versos combusserunt, et prædictam sectam extirpaverunt.” Quoted by Muston, i. 190.

⁴ He calls the *Vaudois*, “Une langue Romane primitive ; idiome intermédiaire entre la decomposition de la langue de Romains, et l'établissement d'un nouveau systeme grammatical ;—circonstance qui atteste la haute antiquité de cet idiome dans le pays que ce peuple habitent.”—Again : “Le langage m'en paraît d'une époque déjà éloignée de sa formation. On y remarque la suppression de quelques consonnes finales : ce qui annonce que les mots de la langue, parlée depuis long temps, avaient déjà perdu quelque chose de leurs dessinences primitives.” *Monumens de la Langue Romane* cxxxvii ; cited by Muston, i. 361.

Romance, or more southern *Provençal*, of the 12th or 13th century, but a *distinct*, indeed a *primitive* language. Now if such be the case,—and it is one on which, as we have seen, M. Raynouard's authority must be held unquestionable,¹—if, I say, the dialect of the Noble Lesson was a language distinct,—indeed *primitively different*,—from that which was spoken in the 12th century in Lyons, Metz, or southern France, it seems plain that *they who used it*, i. e. the people to whom it is addressed, must have been a *different community* from the Poor Men of Lyons,—indeed of a distinct and different *origin*.

And this leads me to say something on the *local site* of this ancient community and language, as being a point not unimportant to the enquiry before us. In the which we shall again be assisted to a conclusion by M. Raynouard's critical judgment on the dialect of the Noble Lesson. For considering that it is, as he assures us, a *primitive* language, of which the formation must be ascribed to the far remote era that followed on the decomposition of the Latin,—and considering also that four centuries and more after this decomposition, it exhibited itself, as the selfsame literary document that we are discussing proves to us, still perfectly preserved amidst the dialects spoken by the surrounding populations, whether in Italian Lombardy, Southern France, or Spain, it would seem that some seclusion, not temporary but permanent, and thus of nature's own imperishable forming, must probably have been both its cradle and its asylum; in short just such a seclusion as the deep mountain vallies of the *Alps* or the *Pyrenees* could alone afford. Which of the two mountain-chains might seem doubtful. The resemblance of the dialect to the *Provençal* of *Languedoc* and its *Troubadours*,²—as Languedoc and Provence lay between the two mountains,—is alike accounted for on either supposition. In favour of the hypothesis of a *Pyrenean* birth-place there may be suggested the resem-

¹ See Note 2, p. 320.

² This is noted by Muston, p. 333.

blance of the Noble Lesson dialect to the old *Catalan*.¹ Again the *Gothic character*, in which Leger tells us that some of the old Vaudois Manuscripts were written,² though not uncommon in the Manuscripts of the *Provençal* writings of the 13th century, was yet, I believe, still more common in the old *Spanish*.³ On the other hand its larger retention of *Latin* words than that to be found either in the Spanish, the Provençal, or other Gaulish dialects,⁴ favors the supposition of an origin nearer Italy; and consequently in those deep vallies of the Cottian Alps that extend East and West into Piedmont and Dauphiny. And when we add to this consideration that of the acknowledged fact that a Vaudois community, speaking and writing the language of the Noble Lesson, were known to be domiciliated in these very vallies of the Cottian Alps in the 13th century,⁵ it will, I think, be felt that the decided preponderance of evidence in-

¹ The resemblance struck me (though quite incompetent to judge in the matter) in comparing the Dialect of the Noble Lesson with that of the *Cronica del Rey En Pere*, by B. D'Escot, in the old Castellán of the xiiiith century: a Chronicle which extends from 1207 to 1285, and is written of transactions in which the author bore a part. It is given in Buchon's *Chroniques Etrangères*, p. 566, &c. [The resemblance, I now see, has been also noted by Raynouard. 2nd Ed.]

² Leger (i. p. 26) speaks of a copy of the Noble Lesson as "written on parchment in the old Gothic Letter." Gilly, who quotes this from him (*Wald. Res.* p. 138,) doubts his using the phrase *Gothic character* correctly; and the Geneva manuscript being in a different character. But probably Leger meant the *Cambridge* copy; for he refers to both. Subsequently (p. 59.) Dr. G. himself makes the broad statement; "The ancient Vaudois Treatises were written in the old Gothic character." *—Ducange on *Litera Gothica* says; "*Gothica*, quæ et *Toletana*, quam Gulfilas Gothorum Episcopus adinvenit, ut auctor est Jornandes in *Chronico*, '*Gulfilas Gothicas literas adinvenit; et Scripturas Sacras in eandem linguam convertit.*' Hæc Hispani usi sunt, donec abrogata est à Bernardo Toletano Primate in Concilio Toletano A. D. 1117."

³ It was not till 1068 that the Papal Legate could succeed in having the *Gothic* Missal superseded in Spain by the Roman. So M'Crie in his *Reformation in Spain*, pp. 21—25. Ducange, we saw in the Note above, dates the change a little later; but all agree that it was near about the end of the xith century. Compare Harduin VI. i. 1075, VI. ii. 1691; and Mosheim xi. 2. 4. 1.

It will be remembered that the South of France, from the Pyrenees to the Alps, was for above a century occupied and ruled by Visi-Gothic Kings.

⁴ See Muston, i. 344.

⁵ In the *Theatrum Statutorum Sabaudicæ Ducis*, A. D. 1682, it is stated that Treaties 400 years old secured personal and religious freedom to the Vaudois of Piedmont. Gilly *Wald. Res.* 75.

* A Specimen of the old Gothic character may be seen in the 2nd Vol. of Horne's *Introduction to the Scripture*: a fac simile being there given from the celebrated Codex of the Gothic New Testament in the Upsal Library.

clines to this side ; and that the *earlier* as well as *later* local *nidus* of the dialect, and those that spoke of it, may reasonably be conjectured to have been in the recesses of the *Cottian Alps*.

And who and whence then the *minister* that addressed this *community* in the Noble Lesson? A *native minister*, or a *missionary* from the body of the *Poor Men of Lyons*?—If the *first*, the point under discussion will be settled. We have then the existence of a *Vaudois minister and sect* in the Alpine vallies of Dauphiny or Piedmont, maintaining Gospel doctrine in opposition to the superstitions and corruption of the Church of Rome, *independent of Peter of Lyons*, and, at the latest, *cotemporary with*, if not *before* him.—I must confess, however, that, after careful consideration, I have been unable to discover in the Noble Lesson any *decisive* reason against the other hypothesis. The sentiments and doctrine that it enjoins are in very many points strikingly similar to those which, as we are told by Reinerius, characterized the Lyonnese Peter and his disciples.¹ And when I add to this the

¹ For example, we are told of Peter and his disciples, that they embraced a life of voluntary poverty, he himself having sold all he had, and distributed to the poor : and in the Noble Lesson we read the injunctions, “ We ought to covet little ; ” “ We must have spiritual poverty of heart ; ” with a warning against “ the caitiff race that love gold and silver.”—It was the sudden and awful death before him of one of his fellow citizens of Lyons that struck Peter, and was in part the cause of his renunciation of the world, and change of life ; and the same is the motive urged in the Noble Lesson : “ Therefore ought we the more to fear, since we are not certain whether death will overtake us to-day or to-morrow.”—There is reference in the Noble Lesson to what Scripture says of the way of salvation, “ from beginning to end ; ” just as might be said by those who had been recently busied in the translation of the whole Scriptures.—The mention it makes of the twelve Apostles as *apostles indeed*, “ Rightly are they so named,” well comports with the hypothesis of its being written by one who had embraced the missionary life and poverty, professedly as being that of the Apostles ;—the which life, as Reiner says, seemed to Peter on his conversion lost among men.—Yet again there is the notice of the state of virginity as rather preferred in Scripture to that of marriage ; although connected with a strong statement as to the indissolubleness of the marriage tie : just accordant with what Reiner reports of there being *two orders* of the *Leonists* ; the one *unmarried*, with a view mostly to missionary work, the other simple christians, undebared from domestic life. Further, in the charge of the Noble Lesson against swearing at all, its inculcation of pure and simple morals, and its protest against the Romish corruptions of idol-worship, of the priest’s assumed power of forgiving sin, of the confessional, and masses for the dead,—in all these things we shall find a marked resemblance to what is said by Reiner of the doctrine of Peter and his Poor Men of Lyons.—Nor, finally, must I omit the reference made in the Noble Lesson to *Pope Sylvester*, as if heading the Popes and Cardinals that had usurped

writer's use of the term *Vaudès*, as the then Romanist term of reproach against the sectaries he belonged to, and consider that in historic records of the last half of the 12th century, the very same term was applied, as an appellative, first to *Peter Valdes* (or *Vaudès*) himself, and a few years after to his followers, the *Poor men of Lyons*, distinctively thus far from other sectaries,¹—the coincidence of appellation seems to me to strengthen my former arguments, in favor of the authorship of the Noble Lesson attaching to Peter himself or one of his missionary disciples.—It may be objected that there is no injunction in the Poem to a life of poverty and missionary labor, such as we know from other testimony to have been embraced by the Poor Men of Lyons. But we are informed by the writer of one of the ancient Treatises on the Lyonnese sect, that there were *two* classes included in it : 1. the *Perfect*, or *Poor Men proper*, consisting of such as might devote themselves to poverty and the missionary life ; 2. the *general body of the disciples*, who lay under no such restrictions.²—Again it may be objected that the Noble Lesson speaks of the Romish superstitions with a measure of severity, as if constituting nothing less

Christ's prerogative of forgiving sin : a notice just accordant with what is said of the *Leonists* referring to Sylvester, as the Pope under whom they seceded from the Romish Church.

¹ So by Walter Mapes, in the year 1779 ; who, in a passage already more than once cited, calls them *Valdesii* : and by Ildephonzo of Arragon ; who in a Decree of 1194 specifies *Waldenses* among other heretics, against whom the Decree was promulgated. The former identifies the sectaries he speaks of with the *Lyonnese Poor men*, by stating that they had their origin from Peter Valdes, a citizen of Lyons ; the latter by giving the *Waldenses* of the Decree the equivalent titles both of *Insabbattati* and *Poor Men of Lyons* ; (“ *Waldenses videlicet, sive Insabbattatos, qui alio nomine se vocant Pauperes de Lugduno* ;” B. P. M. xxv. 190 :)—the appellative *Insabbattati* referring to a particular kind of sandals worn by the Lyonnese missionaries, noted by Conrad of Lichtenau, Ebrard de Bethune, and others.—I do not adduce the Edict of the Bishop of Tours, speaking of *Waldosy* heretics, in 1192, because there is nothing to limit the application of the term to the *Lyonnese Poor Men* ; (see Note 4 p. 323 ;) though I believe such were intended. Nor do I add later Edicts, because the Lyonnese very soon so united with other heretics, as that the term *Waldenses* was no longer distinctive. “ *Valdensium nomen non peculiare, sed commune omnium, à seculo duodecimo.*” Richinius, Pref. to Moneta de Valdens. (Muston, 381 ;)—meaning from after the close of the 12th century.

² I allude to the Anonymous Tractate given in Martene's *Thesaurus Anecdoto*. Tom. v. col. 1781, and of which I have spoken before, p. 315 Notes 1 and 2. See also Facts and Doc. 469, and Faber on the Wald. 468.

than an apostacy from God, and soul-destroying idolatry ;¹ which ill consists with the views of those at least of the *Lyonnese* body, who in 1179 applied to the Pope, for sanction as a preaching order under the Church of Rome.² But a difference of view on the question of separation from the Roman Church might well obtain between different members of their fraternity ; and the same reluctance to quit what was then the Church visible, influence not a few of these *Lyonnese* Reformers, which afterwards influenced some of Luther's disciples, and for a while even Luther himself.³ Or perhaps, (and the reader will see presently that I do not speak from mere fancy in the suggestion,⁴) an increased severity of judgment against Rome and Romish error, might have been learnt by the missionary that wrote the Noble Lesson, from the very community addressed in the Noble Lesson themselves.

Let therefore the supposition of a *Lyonnese* authorship of this Noble Lesson be admitted as probable :—the rather since it precisely agrees with the notices that we find in history : first, that Peter Valdes and his followers had religious Treatises prepared, as well as the Bible ;⁵

¹ “ And we may see that those now become still worse (than Adam), who abandon God the Father Almighty, and believe in idols, to their own destruction.”

² See the Narrative by Walter Mapes.—A similar application was made by others of the *Lyonnese* body, according to Conrad of Lichtenau, in the year 1212 ; to the which allusion is also made by the anonymous writer of the Tractate de Paup. de Lugd. in Martene. The author infers their recognition of the apostolic Primacy of Rome from the application : “ *adhuc recognoscentes primum apud ipsum (Dominum Papam) residere apostolicæ potestatis.*”—It is mentioned by M'Cric, in his History of the Reformation in Spain, p. 37, that after the discussion at Pamiers in 1203, Durando de Huesca, an Arragonese, and some of his Albigensian or Waldensian brethren, actually formed themselves into a religious fraternity *under Papal sanction* ; and lived some time in Catalonia, with the appellation of the *Society of Poor Catholics*. They were, however, soon suspected to be heretics in disguise ; and consequently persecuted, and exterminated.

³ See my sketch of Luther's early history, p. 113 *suprà*. Staupitz was an early and notable example among his friends and followers.

⁴ See Note 1 on the next page.

⁵ This is noted by Stephen of Borbonne ; “ In like manner Peter Valdes had translated many books of the Bible, and authorities of the Fathers, which they call *Sentences* :” also in Innocent the third's Letter, (Ep. 141) dated 1199, to the Christians of Metz, before cited. “ *Evangelia,*” he writes, “ *et plures alios libros sibi fecit in Gallico sermone transferri.*”—See also Lucas de Tuy's Chapters, headed, “ *Arnaldus hæreticus sanctorum Patrum scripta corrumpit ;*” and,

next, that Dauphny and Piedmont were districts to which the course of some of these Poor Men of Lyons was specially directed, when flying from a persecution that early broke out in that city,¹ and that they there met and mixed with other heretics.²—But what then?—Does it follow that from the Noble Lesson no evidence is derivable, whereby to prove the two points now under discussion: viz. first, the existence of evangelic christians, dissentient from Rome, prior to Peter and his Lyonnese missionaries; secondly, the existence of such in the secluded Alpine vallies, that branch from the Cottian chain, just spoken of? Not so. Of the first we may discern evidence in its sketch, brief as it is, of the history of gospel-preaching. “After the Apostles,” it says, “were *certain teachers*: they shewed the *way of Jesus Christ* our Saviour. And these are found *even to the present time*: but they are manifest to only few persons. These greatly wish to shew the way of Jesus Christ; but they are so persecuted that they can do only little. So much are false Christians blinded by error; most of all their pastors: &c.” Now in this it is to be remarked not only that there is no mention of Peter Valdès and the Lyonnese revival,—though, surely, had his preaching of evangelic doctrine, in contrast with that of the Romish Church, been so complete a novelty after an interval of ages as Bossuet and Maitland would re-

“Hæretici schedas continentes hæresim in populum occultè spargunt.” Lib. iii. ch. 17, 18. B. P. M. xxv. 247. This refers to the xiiith century. The *Sentences* were, I suppose, for general circulation and reading.

¹ “Lugduno fugientes ad ultimas Delphinatûs partes se transferentes in Ebre-dunensi et Taurinensi Diocæsibus, in Alpibus, et intrâ concava montium accessu difficilia, plures ibi ex illis habitaverunt.” Inquisitor Anon. De Valdens. ap. Allix, p. 324. So too Thuanus. (Faber, 512, 521.)

A Decretal Epistle of Innocent III corroborates this fact, addressed A. D. 1199 to the Prelates of Narbonne, Aix, Viennè, Arles, Embrun, Tarascon, and Lyons, with their several suffragans; and which begins, “We have heard that in your province certain persons called Waldenses, Cathari, Patarini, and by other names, have pullulated to so vast an extent as to entangle in the snare of their error an innumerable multitude of people.” Ib. 519.

² “. . . in Provinciâ terrâ ef Lombardiâ cum aliis hæreticis se admiscentes, et errorem eorum bibentes et serentes, hæretici sunt judicati.” So Stephen of Borbonne, *De Septem Donis*, Tit. vii. c. 31. (Faber, 514)—Reiner (ch. 5 on the Leonistæ) intimates as his judgment, that the Leonists did not become decided anti-Romanists until excommunicated by the Pope; i. e. not till 1179.

present it, *it is most unlikely that so extraordinary a religious discovery and revival would have been passed over in silence by the Noble Lesson*;—but besides, and instead of any such representation, it is implied in the quotation that there had been a transmission of the same apostolic doctrine that the Poem taught *continuously*, though by a line of but few, and those persecuted for it, from the date of certain teachers that had followed after the Apostles, down to the time then present.—Further, it seems otherwise inferable from the Noble Lesson, that the very people addressed in it,—the same that spoke its Alpine dialect,—were with this evangelic and anti-Romish line not unconnected. For they are styled at the commencement of the Poem *Brethren*.¹ Their faults are spoken of in it as those, not of Romish error, but simply of religious lukewarmness and worldliness.² There is not a single exhortation to them to come out from Rome, and be separate. On the contrary the Romanists are mentioned distinctly and contrastedly; viz. as the caitiff race, &c.³ Yet more, we may, I think, infer both from the character of the poem, and its self-given title of a *Lesson* or *Lectio*, that it was written not merely as a manual for private perusal among these Alpine christians, but for reading in their *church assemblies*;—assemblies, we might presume, already prepared in the district for such readings.⁴

Such is the presumptive evidence observable in the *Noble Lesson*,⁵ in favor of the two points contended for :

¹ “Hear, *Brethren*, a Noble Lesson !”

² “We Christians, unworthy the name of Christians, who have sinned and abandoned the law of Jesus Christ, (for we have neither fear, nor faith, nor charity,) ought to confess our sins without delay; amending ourselves with weeping and penitence, in respect to the offences which have been done through three mortal sins, viz. the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life, through which we have done ill.”

³ “Though the saying be hard to be received by the caitiff race, who love silver and gold; who depreciate the promises of God; who keep not his laws nor commandments; and suffer not good people to keep them, but rather hinder them according to their power.”

⁴ On the *Lectio*, or *Church Lesson*, (a term which is still perpetuated in our own ritual,) see Martene De Rit.

⁵ In the next Section copious translated extracts will be given of this most

—viz. the *existence before Peter Valdes* of teachers of *the way of Jesus*, corresponding with him in sentiment, contra-distinctively to the superstitions of Rome ; and their pre-existence *locally* in the sub-Alpine districts of *Dauphiny* or *Piedmont*. It well tallies, we see, both with those *later Waldensian traditions*, and *hostile admissions* which I before detailed in the present Section ; and also with the earlier historic notices given briefly some time since in the 2nd and 4th Sections of this same Chapter :—notices, it may be remembered, of sectaries existing in the Alpine and sub-Alpine districts of Piedmont, Dauphiny, and Switzerland, during the earlier half of the xiith century, that held a similar protest against the corruptions of the Romish Church, and similar religious views and habits in the main, so far as we were able to form a judgment, to those of Peter Valdes and the Waldenses of the Noble Lesson.¹ Such more especially was *Henry of Lausanne*, (himself, be it marked, a Vaudois or Valdensis by country,) the chief of the *Henrician* sectaries in those districts, about the year A. D. 1144 : such *Peter de Bruys*, the head of the cognate *Petrobrussian* sect, in nearly the same parts, just before him :²—each professedly as in connexion with Christ's *true Church*, contradistinctively to the Church established,³ and as of a line not then new, but traceable back to the Apostles.⁴ And considering that we find mention yet a century earlier of sectaries of the same character, about A. D. 1030, in Piedmont,⁵ and that the effect of the personal labours of Claude of Turin, the

interesting document, including the passages which have in the present Section been referred to ; in the Appendix, as before intimated, the original Poem itself.

¹ Let me here insert a further notice of these precursors of Peter Valdes ; which occurs in a Letter written to Pope Lucius II, in the year 1144. The writer speaks in it of a religious community in Dauphiny, " which had its divers degrees, its neophytes, its priests, and even its bishops ; and which maintained that sins are not remitted by the sprinkling of water only, in baptism ; and that the eucharist and the imposition of hands, administered by the Romish clergy, availed nothing. Every part of France," it concludes, " is polluted by the poison issuing from this region." Given in Martene and Durand *Amplius*. Coll. Quoted by Gilly in his *Life of Neff*, p. 95.

² See pp. 250, &c, *suprà*.

³ Bernard in his *Epist.* 241 states this of *Henry of Lausanne*.

⁴ See p. 254 *suprà*.

⁵ See p. 228 *suprà*, from Schmidt.

great Protestant of the 9th century, in separating a distinct sect of dissentients from the corruptions of the Apostacy in Piedmont, as his antagonist Dungal informs us,¹ could not in the nature of things have ended with that century, but must, humanly speaking, have had perpetuation in the 10th,—I cannot but feel persuaded that we may conclude on the Leonist and Piedmontese Waldenses of the close of the 12th century, being but the lineal religious descendants from Claude of Turin, four centuries before them : the intermediate confessors being indeed “manifest but to few persons,” as the Noble Lesson says ; but with a line of perpetuation unbroken, though so imperfectly traceable, and with certain of the disciples ever domiciled among the recesses of the Alps.

To which let me add, in conclusion, just one further remark. I have already hinted more than once,² and indeed in the very Title of my 4th Section, headed “On the *Joint Middle-Age Witnesses*,” have almost expressed my conviction, as to the doubtfulness of the exact origin of sundry of the witnessing bodies of the 11th century ; whether from the *Paulikian* immigrants from the *East*, or from sectaries of a *native* growth among the Alpine vallies of *Western Europe*. What has been now said will corroborate that doubtfulness ; and leave, if I mistake not, a strong impression with the reader, (even though a certain document too much relied on by some fail us,³) that the Christian sectaries of *Pauli-*

¹ See p. 222 *suprà*. Jonas notes the fact of the poison of his doctrine having extended to *Germans* and *Gauls*, as well as *Italians*. See p. 223.

² So at pp. 242, 253, 254, 272, &c.

³ The Document that I allude to is one professing to be an extract from a manuscript chronicle of the Abbey of Corvey ;* in date referring to the *first half* of the xiith century ; and which is as follows :—

“Religionem nostram et omnium Latinæ ecclesiæ Christianorum fidem laici ex Suaviâ, Suiciâ, et Baviariâ humiliare voluerunt :—homines seducti ab antiquâ progenie simplicium hominum, qui Alpes et vicinium habitant, et semper amant antiqua. In Suaviam, Baviariam, et Italiam sæpe intrant illorum (ex Suiciâ)

* There were two *Correys*, each with its Abbey ; one near *Amiens*, founded in A. D. 662 by Clothaire III, and which was called *Old Corbie* ;—the other in *Westphalia* on the *Weser*, near Paderborn ; the Abbey of which was founded by Louis le Debonnaire A. D. 822, and called *New Corbie*. It is to this last that the manuscript belonged.

kian origin, and those of *Alpine* origin, must have already often before Peter Valdes' time been associated, and, like drops of water of the same purity, commingled and run together. The *Orleanist* sectaries originated, we read, from a woman teacher that came about 1022 from *the borders of Italy*;¹ again the sectaries at *Arras* were in 1025 taught by a minister *from the Italian borders*.¹

mercatores : qui Biblia ediscunt memoriter, et ritus ecclesiæ aversantur, quos credunt esse novos. Nolunt imagines venerari ; reliquias sanctorum aversantur ; olera comedunt ; rarò masticantes carnem, alii nunquam. Appellamus eos idcirco Manichæos. Horum quidam ab Hungariâ ad eos convenerunt," &c.

Mr. Hallam, after quoting the above from Planta's Helvetic Confederacy, Vol. i. p. 92, observes ; " It is a pity that the quotation has been broken off ; as it might have illustrated the connexion of the Bulgarians with these (Alpine) sectaries." To myself it appeared still more to be regretted that Planta had not stated the *authority* on which he gave it as an extract from the Chronicle of Corvey, and shewn its *authenticity* and *genuineness*. For, on considering the manner in which it told on all the great debated questions respecting the Waldenses and Paulikians,—the antiquity of the former before 1160, i. e. before Peter Valdes,—their Alpine residence from time immemorial,—their simple and primitive evangelic sentiments,—their union and communion with other sectaries that had come from Hungary (i. e. the Paulikians),—and the fact of the *Manichean* charge having been only made against them because of their adoption generally of a diet of herbs,—the passage seemed to me almost *too much* to the point, and so open to grave suspicions. With some difficulty I traced the quotation from Planta to Müller's History of Switzerland ; and found that the latter had borrowed it from Harenberg's *Monumenta Historica adhuc inedita* :—which Harenberg held the respectable station of Inspector of Schools in the Duchy of Brunswick, about the middle of last century, and had access to the manuscript Chronicle from which the extract professes to have been taken.—The circumstance of his having committed himself in a Dissertation that I met with, written expressly in support of the antiquity of the Waldenses, but in which this striking evidence in favour of his proposition was unnoticed, increased my suspicions.—Unable myself to inspect the manuscript in question, I was so fortunate as to open a communication on the subject, through the intervention of a literary relative, with Dr. Pertz, author of the great Work, still I believe uncompleted, of the *Monumenta Germaniæ*, and Principal Librarian to the King of Hanover : the very person of all others from whom to obtain correct information on the point ; as having had free access to this manuscript of Corvey among others, and made use of it for his *Monumenta Germaniæ*. He at once, on seeing the extract, declared it a *forgery* ; and confirmed the judgment by a subsequent personal examination of the manuscript. He writes that in Harenberg's Work, (p. 77) the extract is given as from the *Second Continuation* of the Chronicle of Corvey ; that not only this extract, but the whole of what he calls the *Second Continuation*, was *invented by Harenberg* ; that Harenberg's character was well known in Hanover as a *literary impostor* ; that the particular forgery was denounced, not long after publication, by Schidt (Editor of the *Origines Guelforum*) in his Review of Harenberg's Work in the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* of 1759, pp. 757, 758 : also that he (Dr. Pertz) would feel himself obliged to denounce the forgery in his Preface to the *Annales Corbeïenses*, printed at the beginning of the 5th Volume of his *Monumenta Germaniæ* :—an intention which I see he has since carried into effect.

Since instituting this inquiry I have found that, besides Müller, Planta, and Hallam, the quotation has been given and reasoned on sundry times, as genuine, by Giesler in his *Annals of Christianity*, and Muston in his *Histoire des Vaudois*, p. 263, &c.

¹ See p. 243.

Who shall say from which of the two lines these teachers?—The rather because *after* the rise of Peter Valdes it is allowed on all hands that there soon took place a commingling of his immediate followers with sectaries in the Alpine vallies, and others elsewhere: insomuch that *Waldenses* became thenceforward a kind of generic name to the intermingled sectaries, and Piedmont and Lombardy as confessedly their chief centre of settlement.

It is of this united body, from near about the end of the 12th century, that I purpose to speak in the ensuing Section; and to show that they bore, just like those before them, the marks of witnesses for Christ. And let me add that the *Petro-Valdensian epoch*, which has been my subject in the present Section, will there and then appear to have been not otherwise only an epoch memorable in the history of the sect: but also very specially as that of the first extant document of *their own writing*, with its irrefragable evidence to their true witness-character;—I mean the document of the *Noble Lesson*.

§ 7.—THE WALDENSES, FROM AFTER THE RISE OF PETER VALDES, TRUE CHRISTIAN WITNESSES.

In evidence on this head let me first briefly sketch the primary forty or fifty years *history* of these Waldenses; then exhibit illustrations of their *doctrine, missionary proceedings, and character*.

1. It has been already observed that it was about 1170 A. D. that *Peter Valdes*, previously a rich merchant at Lyons, commenced his ministrations as a preacher of the Gospel:² and that it was from connexion with some place or people of *Valdensian* name, that he probably derived both his appellation of *Valdes*, and more or less his religious views.³ Tradition runs that the sudden death before his eyes of one of his friends and fellow-citizens, awakening solemn thoughts of eter-

¹ See p. 248.

² See p. 307.

³ p. 312.

nity, (just as with Luther long afterwards,¹) induced him to take the decisive step of quitting his merchandize, distributing his wealth to the poor, and giving himself to the preaching of the gospel.² An interesting cotemporary Chronicle refers the change rather to the impression made by a pilgrim-minstrel, rehearsing the Life of St. Alexis in the streets of Lyons.³ In his ministrations he made the Holy Scriptures, then, among the laity at least, almost forgotten and unknown, the groundwork of his teaching; directing and diffusing a translation of them in the vulgar tongue, for the better evangelization of the people: in doing which he gathered disciples in numbers round him, who soon became conspicuous as a congregation of separatists from the Romish Church.—It was not long before persecution followed. It originated with the Archbishop; and within 3 or 4 years was so severe as to issue in the expatriation from Lyons of Peter Valdes and his followers, now called both *Leonists* and *Valdenses*.⁴ But the consequence of their dispersion,—just as of that of the primitive disciples after the death of Stephen,—was the dissemination of evangelic truth. The scattered bands of Waldenses went every where, preaching the gospel. With a success that is perfectly astonishing, they appear before the end of the 12th century to have not only preached, but formed churches of proselytes,—churches that were perpetuated from the most part through the next and following centuries,—alike in Spain, Italy, the South and North of France, Flanders, Germany, Bohemia: in which last-named country Peter Valdes himself, about the year 1180, is said to have ended his career.⁵—A career truly apostolic! He had indeed gloriously done the work assigned him, and finished his course, and kept the faith.

Such, in brief, was the rise and early progress and settlements of the Leonist Waldenses; a progress which was

¹ See p. 91.

² So Milner xiii. 1, from Perrin, &c.

³ *Chronicon Laudunense*, ap. Bouquet. So Dr. Gilly kindly informs me.

⁴ So Thuanus.—Milner's account is full and interesting, as given in the four first chapters of his xiiiith century. He has not however sufficiently discriminated between the Waldensian Manuscripts of earlier and later date. ⁵ *Ib.*

every where marked by edicts and acts of persecution against them, of which more hereafter. And let me here again repeat two recorded and important facts concerning them. The *first* is that of their speedy union and amalgamation with certain other reputed heretics of different and earlier origin: I mean especially with heretics called *Albigenses*, probably of *Paulikian* origin, in the parts of Albi and Toulouse; ¹ and again with others, probably of *native* origin, in Provence, Dauphiny, and Lombardy; ²—of which latter the *Noble Lesson* may be regarded as a monument.³ The *second* fact is that of their chief gathering into Piedmont and Lombardy, after this amalgamation; at first in wider diffusion and with more of prosperity, through the first half of the xiiith century; ⁴ then, on the fiercer breaking out of persecution,

¹ See the account of the Conference at Montreal in the year 1207 between the Romanists on the one side and the Waldenses and Albigenses conjointly on the other, in Faber 504—514.—Richinius says; “Valdensium nomen non peculiare alicujus sectæ aut hæreseos, sed commune omnium, à seculo duodecimo.”

² “Postea in *Provincia terrâ et Lombardiæ* cum aliis hæreticis se admiscentes, et errorem eorum bibentes et serentes, hæretici sunt judicati.” So Stephen of Borbonne, quoted by me before, p. 333. In which statement I also observed on his attributing the Leonist Waldenses’ more decided anti-Romanist protestation to the influence of these other heretics of Provence and Lombardy.—It was not with all heretics that the Leonists thus united. It is expressly said by Lucas of Tuy that against the *Manicheans* they vehemently disputed. And so too William of Puy Laurens.—In 1207 *Nicolas Vignez*, or *Vignier*, mentions that seven *Vaudois of Provence* were burnt, besides many others in other parts of France. Muston, 115. He adds that from their sect 100 years before arose the *Albigensian* heresy.

³ See p. 334.

⁴ Thus *Malvenda*, cited by *Richinius*, says on the year 1220, “pullulasse et excrevisse per hæc tempora in *Lombardiâ* gravia germina *Valdensium*.” Muston p. 265.—On the year 1225, *Raynald* (*Annals*) quotes a Letter from *Honorius III* to the Bishops of *Ariminum* and *Brixia*, stating that the heretics at *Brixia* had destroyed some churches, and actually excommunicated the Church of Rome.—Among the *Sicilian* Constitutions of the Emperor *Frederic II* we find the following notice of the subject before us; the date being somewhere between A. D. 1225 and 1244. “Ab *Italiæ* finibus, præsertim à partibus *Longobardiæ*, in quibus pro certo perpendimus ipsorum nequitiam amplius abundare, jam usque ad regnum nostrum *Siciliæ* suæ perfidiæ rivulos derivarunt.” See Muston, 223; *Facts and Doc.* 205.—About the year 1230, in a persecution against heretics in *Alsace*, it appeared that they were accustomed to send an annual census to *Milan*, as the *Waldensian* seat of primacy. Muston, 226.—In 1250 *Reinerius* again describes the extension of the *Waldenses* in *Lombardy*:—also we read in *Muratori*, on the year 1259, that *Ubert*, Lord of *Milan*, *Cremona*, *Brescia*, *Vercelli*, *Como*, &c, was such a favourer of the heretics, that they publicly preached their errors through his dominions, and had their Schools and Professors of Theology; and that *Inquisitors* were not allowed to interfere. Must. 182.—To the same effect are the statements of the renegade *Ivo*, and of the same date, given at the end of this Section; also the summary notice of the early *Waldensian* history given by the *Anonymous Inquisitor*, quoted p. 333 *suprà*.

into the recesses of the Cottian Alps : ¹ but still in such numbers as to make Piedmont for centuries after the centre and head-quarters of the widely extended Waldensian sect.²

2. With regard to the *doctrine* of the Waldenses, their own writings offer us, of course, the best evidence. I have therefore subjoined below the same copious extracts nearly from the *Noble Lesson* that have been given before by Mr. Faber ; and also extracts from another of their works entitled *Antichrist*. In the former,³ written,

¹ So *Thuanus*. “Omnibus invisi exules per Provinciam Narbonensem, Galliam Cisalpinam, ac præcipuè inter *Alpes* effunduntur; ubi, tutissimum perflugium nacti, complures annos latuerunt.” Faber, 500. Eymeric says, “Per partes Franciæ et Italiæ dispersi.” *Ib.*

² So Reinerius, ch. 5 : “Item peregrinantur (Leoniste); et ita *Lombardiam intrantes*, visitant episcopos suos.”—Of the persecutions of the xivth century it is *Piedmont* that is the scene most noted.

³ “O Brethren, hear a Noble Lesson.

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Now we who shall not do what is contained in this Lesson, shall not enter

as it has appeared, within some 20 years of 1170, the following doctrines are drawn out with much simplicity and beauty :—the origin of sin in the fall of Adam, its

into the holy house : though the saying be hard to be received by the caitiff race ; who love gold and silver, who depreciate the promises of God, who keep neither his laws nor his commandments, and who suffer not good people to keep them, but rather hinder them according to their power.

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

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

The Author then gives a brief summary of the history of the Old Testament ; until, following the stream of chronology, and reaching the times of the Gospel Dispensation, he comes to the history of our Lord’s incarnation, miracles, and doctrine. Respecting the last he says ; “ He changed not the Law which He had before given, that it might be abandoned, but renewed it that it might be better kept : ” and then in different particulars illustrates the superior spirituality of the moral Law under the Gospel.* After which he relates the crucifixion of Christ, and first mission of the Apostles ; noticing the persecutions suffered by them, and by the primitive Christians, in the fulfilment of their mission ; and then passes to the sufferings which the Vaudois themselves,—both the writer and the readers of the Noble Lesson,—had to undergo in preaching and following the Gospel.

“ The Apostles were so strong in the fear of the Lord, as also both the men and the women that were with them, that for these things they ceased not either their doings or their sayings : for many of them were determined to have Jesus Christ. Great were the torments, according to what is written, only because they shewed the way of Jesus Christ. But, as for those who persecuted them, it was not so much for *them* to hold to the bad ; because they had not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ :—like those who now take occasion, and who persecute so much ; who ought to be Christians, but whose semblance is evil. Yet in this they ought to be reprehended, because they persecute and imprison the good : for in no Lesson is it found that the saints imprisoned or persecuted any one.—Now, after the Apostles were certain teachers : they shewed the way of Jesus Christ our Saviour. And these are found even to the present time : but they are manifest to only few people. These greatly wish to shew the way of Jesus Christ ; but they are so persecuted, that they can do only little. So much are false christians blinded with error ; and, more than all the others, those who are their pastors. For they persecute and hate those who are better than themselves ; and they let those live quietly who are false deceivers. But by this we may know that they are not good pastors : because they love not the flock, save for their fleeces. Yet the Scripture says, and we may see it, that if a person loves those who are good, he will wish to love God, and to fear Jesus Christ ; and that he will neither curse, nor swear, nor lie, nor commit adultery, nor kill, nor defraud his neighbour, nor revenge himself upon his enemies.—Nevertheless

* He dwells particularly on the gospel injunction of not rendering evil for evil, but even loving enemies. “ The New Law saith, Pardon all mankind, and thou shalt find pardon from the Father Almighty.” Then : “ None ought to kill or hate any person : nor ought we to scoff at the simple and the poor ; nor to hold as vile the stranger who comes from another country : for in this world we are all pilgrims.” A passage already referred to as characteristic of the state of the Vaudois addressed in the Poem.—Compare on the *pilgrim*-view what I have noted at p. 304 of the Paulikians.

transmission to all men, and the offered redemption from it through the death of Jesus Christ ; the union and co-operation of the three Persons of the blessed Trinity in

they say that such a person is a *Vaudes*, and is worthy of punishment : and they find occasion, through lyes and deceit, to take from him that which he has gotten by his just labour. But he who is thus persecuted strengthens himself greatly through the fear of the Lord : for the kingdom of heaven shall be given to him at the end of the world. Then shall he have great glory in the place of such dishonour.

“ But in this is greatly manifested their malice : that those who will curse, and lie, and swear, and put out money to usury, and kill, and commit adultery, and revenge themselves upon those who do evil to them, are said and reckoned to be good and loyal men. Yet let such a person take heed, that he be not deceived at the end, when his mortal malady comes, when death seizes upon him, and when he is scarcely able to speak. Then he calls for the priest, and wishes to confess himself : but, according to the Scripture, he has delayed too long : for it commands and says that thou shouldest confess while in sound health, and not wait to the last. The priest tells him that he cannot be forgiven, if he does not restore all that he has taken from another, and well examine his sins. When he hears this, he has great trouble : and he thinks within himself, If he shall restore it entirely, what will remain to his children, and what will the world say ? Then he commands his children to examine their faults ; and gives money to the priest, that he himself may receive absolution. Though he has extorted from another a hundred pounds, or perhaps two, yet the priest will pardon him for a hundred pence, and sometimes for less, when he can get no more. And he tells him a long story, and promises him pardon : for he will say mass, both for him, and for his forefathers. Thus grants he pardon to them, whether they be just or felonious ; and he puts his hand upon their heads. And, when he leaves them, he occasions a grand festival : for he makes them to understand that they have been very well absolved. Yet ill are they confessed, who are thus faulty : and they will certainly be deceived by such an absolution : and he that makes them believe it sins mortally. For I dare to say, and it will be found very true, that all the Popes, from *Sylvester* down to the present one, and all the Cardinals, and all the Bishops, and all the Abbots, even all such put together, have no power to absolve or to pardon a single creature, in regard to a single mortal sin ; inasmuch as God alone pardons, and no other can do it.

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

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

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

“ We have only to imitate Jesus Christ, and to do his pleasure, and to keep firmly that which he has commanded, and to be well advised when *Antichrist* shall come, that we may give no credence either to his doings or to his sayings.

man's salvation ; the obligation and spirituality of the moral law under the gospel ; the duties of prayer, watchfulness, self-denial, unworldliness, humility, love, as "the way of Jesus Christ ;" their enforcement by the prospect of death, and judgment, and the world's near ending, by the narrowness too of the way of life, and the fewness of those that find it, as also by the hope of coming glory at the judgment and revelation of Jesus Christ :—all these points, I say, of christian doctrine are drawn out in the Noble Lesson very simply and beautifully. Besides which we find in it a protest against the Romish system generally as one of soul-destroying idolatry, against masses for the dead, and therein against the whole doctrine of purgatory, against the system of the confessional, and asserted power of the priesthood to absolve from sin ; this last point being insisted on as the most deadly point of heresy, and its origin referred to the mercenariness of the priesthood, and their love of money ;¹ the iniquity further noticed of the Romish persecutions of good men and teachers that wished to teach the way of Jesus Christ ; and the suspicion half hinted, and apparently half formed, that though a *personal Antichrist* might be expected, yet *Popery* itself might very possibly

But, according to Scripture, there are many Antichrists : for all who are contrary to Christ are Antichrist.

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

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

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

¹ So Wieliff. "Of all heresies none is greater than the belief that a man may be absolved from sin if he give money : or because a priest layeth his hand on the head, and saith, I absolve thee." Le Bas. p. 201.

Contrast Pope John the XVIIIth's declaration, in a Letter (dated in 1024) of absolution to Bishop Hugo : "Nullum in ecclesiâ catholicâ majus potest esse nefas quàm existimare alicujus nævum eriminis, præcipuè penitentis, quod non queat dissolvere concessa Petro à Domino clavis." Hard, vi. 839.

be *one form of Antichrist*.—Such is the doctrine of the *Noble Lesson*.—In the *Treatise of Antichrist* we advance to an admirable and direct identification of the *antichristian* system and the *Papacy*: which, though written after the period we are passing under review,—perhaps in the last quarter of the xivth century,¹—may yet be fairly presumed to exhibit the opinions of the Vaudois of the xiiiith century on the subject: they having embraced, as we know, at the least as early as that period, the view of the Papacy and Roman Church being the very Babylon and Harlot of the Apocalypse. Extracts from this too are subjoined below.² And from them the following will appear to have been the Waldensian views:—that

¹ The following internal *chronological* marks appear in the *Treatise on Antichrist*. It describes Antichrist as having then attained to the full age of a perfect man; indeed as being old, and beginning to diminish in power and authority. “For the Lord,” it says, “is already destroying the felon by the breath of his mouth, through many men of good intentions; dissipating his possessions and places, and dividing the city of Babylon.” Further *Augustine’s Milleloquium* is quoted in it.—Now as the *Milleloquium* was not published till the middle of the xiiiith century, the work must be dated after that time. And, perhaps, as the great Papal schism occurred a century later, and at that time, besides the Waldenses, Wicliff was writing against Antichrist, that may be regarded as not improbably the real date.—Had it been written after Luther’s time, the *Pope*, I think, would have been directly and personally called *Antichrist* in it: and, instead of noting his cloak of religious ritualism, “lest he should be rejected as a heathen,” (see the close of my quotation,) would have said that he actually had been rejected as such. Compare pp. 186, 187 *suprà*.

² “Antichrist is the falsehood of eternal damnation, covered with the appearance of the truth and righteousness of Christ and his spouse. The iniquity of such a system is with all his ministers great and small: and, inasmuch as they follow the law of an evil and blinded heart, such a congregation, taken together, is called *Antichrist, or Babylon, or the fourth Beast, or the Harlot, or the Man of Sin, who is the son of perdition*.

“His first work is, that the service of *latría*, properly due to *God* alone, he perverts unto Antichrist himself and to his doings: to the poor creature, rational or irrational, sensible or insensible; as for instance, to male or female saints departed this life, and to their images, or carcasses, or relics. His doings are the *sacraments*, especially that of the *eucharist*, which he worships equally with *God* and *Christ*, prohibiting the adoration of *God* alone.

“His second work is, that he robs and deprives *Christ* of the merits of *Christ*, with the whole sufficiency of grace, and justification, and regeneration, and remission of sins, and sanctification, and confirmation, and spiritual nourishment; and imputes and attributes them to his own authority, or to a form of words, or to his own performances, or to the saints and their intercession, or to the fire of purgatory. Thus he *divides the people from Christ*, and leads them away to the things already mentioned: that so they may not seek the things of *Christ*, nor through *Christ*, but only the works of their own hands; and not through a living faith in *God*, and *Jesus Christ*, and the *Holy Spirit*; but through the will and the works of *Antichrist*, agreeably to his preaching that man’s salvation depends upon his own deeds.

“His third work is, that he attributes the regeneration of the *Holy Spirit*, to

the *Papal* or *Romish* system was that of *Antichrist*; which, from infancy in apostolic times, had grown gradually, by the increase of its constituent parts, to the stature of a full-grown man: that its prominent characteristics were,—to defraud *God* of the worship due to Him, rendering it to creatures, whether departed saints, relics, images, or Antichrist, i. e. the antichristian body itself;—to defraud *Christ*, by attributing justification and forgiveness to Antichrist's authority and words, to saint's intercessions, to the merit of men's own performances, and to the fire of purgatory;—to defraud the *Holy Spirit* by attributing regeneration and sanctification to the opus operatum (I borrow the Tridentine term used afterwards) of the two sacraments:—that the origin of this antichristian religion was the covetousness of the priesthood; its tendency to lead men away from Christ; its essence a vain ceremonial; its foundation the false notions of grace and forgiveness.

How true, how admirable the description!—Let me observe that it will be found well to agree with *Reiner's* account of the Waldensian anti-Romish doctrine given, as before observed,¹ in the middle of the xiiiith century: also that the reference in the work to the *Milleloquium* of *Augustine* indicates the same doctrinal accordance a dead outward faith: baptizing children in that faith; and teaching that by the mere outward consecration of baptism, regeneration may be procured.

“His fourth work is, that he rests the whole religion of the people upon his Mass: for leading them to hear it, he deprives them of spiritual and sacramental manducation.

“His fifth work is, that he does every thing to be seen, and to glut his insatiable avarice.

“His sixth work is, that he allows manifest sins without ecclesiastical censure.

“His seventh work is, that he defends his unity not by the Holy Spirit, but by the secular power.

“His eighth work is, that he hates, and persecutes, and searches after, and robs, and destroys the members of Christ.

“These things, and many others, are the cloak and vestment of Antichrist; by which he covers his lying wickedness, lest he should be rejected as a heathen—But there is no other cause of idolatry than a false opinion of grace, and truth, and authority, and invocation, and intercession: which this Antichrist has taken away from God; and which he has ascribed to ceremonies and authorities, and a man's own works, and saints, and purgatory.”

The recognition of the Romish “false opinion of grace,” and preservation of the true Augustinian gospel-doctrine of grace and forgiveness, throughout the dark ages, is a fact most observable. Merle (i. 17) well remarks on it as the *antagonist principle* which was at length to introduce the Reformation, and shake the whole power of Rome.

¹ See Note 3, p. 324, *suprà*, &c.

with *Augustine* on the part of the Waldenses, as on the part of the earlier evangelic christians in Dauphiny and Piedmont. Their accordance with *Vigilantius* is palpable.

3. With regard to the Waldensian *morals* and *character*, I shall only quote their brief description by *Reinerius*. "Heretics are distinguished by their manners and their words. For they are sedate and modest in their manners. They have no pride in clothes; for they wear such as are neither costly nor mean. They do not carry on commerce, in order that they may avoid falsehoods, oaths, and frauds; but live by labor as workmen. Their teachers also are shoemakers and weavers. They do not multiply riches; but are content with what is necessary. They are chaste, especially the *Leonists*: and are temperate also in meat and drink. They do not go to taverns, dances, or other vanities. They restrain themselves from anger. They are always at work, learning or teaching.¹ They abstain from scurrility, detraction, and levity in discourse; and also from lying and swearing."

4. As to their *missionary plans and proceedings*, it may here also suffice to quote *Reiner*. I just premise that though he relates what follows of heretics generally, it seems to me specially intended by him of the *Leonist Waldenses*: also that whereas (see p. 331 *suprà*) there were two classes among these Waldenses,—the first called *perfect*, who left home, gave up property, and devoted themselves to the missionary life, the other the *general* members, who lay under no such restriction,—it was to the *first* of these that the quotation has reference.

"The heretics," he says, "craftily devise how they may introduce themselves to the acquaintance of the noble and great. And they do it in this manner. They exhibit to

¹ He adds, "And so they pray but little:" also a statement of their hypocritically at times attending the Romish Church. How ill the *parum orant*, "they pray little," applies to the Leonist Waldenses, appears sufficiently from the strong exhortations to watch and pray always, inculcated in the Noble Lesson.

gentlemen and ladies some kind of tempting wares, such as rings and kerchiefs for sale. Having sold them, if the man is asked, Have you anything more to sell? he answers, I have more precious gems than these: and I will give them you, if you will not betray me to the clergy. Having received security, he says; I have one brilliant gem from God, whereby men may have the knowledge of God. I have another, which shines so that it kindles the love of God in the heart of him who possesses it:—and so of the others. He speaks of gems metaphorically. After that he recites some devout chapter, as that of Luke; “The Angel Gabriel was sent,” &c; or from our Lord’s discourse, John xiii; “Now before the feast,” &c. When he has begun to interest his reader, he adds what is said in Matt. xxiii of them that sate in Moses’ seat, “Woe unto you! ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye enter not in yourselves, and ye forbid others to enter:” and from Mark xii; “Woe unto you who devour widows’ houses,” and what follows. When asked by his hearers of whom these imprecations are to be understood, he answers, Of the clergy and monks.

“After this the heretic draws a comparison between the circumstances of the Romish church, and those of his sect; saying thus. The doctors of the Romish church are proud in their dress and carriage; they love the chief seats, and seek to be called of men Rabbi; but such Rabbies *we* do not desire to have. Also they are incontinent: but each one of us has his wife, and lives chastely with her. Also they are the rich and covetous, to whom it is said, Woe unto you rich; ye have received your consolation: but we, having food and clothes to cover us, are content therewith. Also they fight and make wars, and command the poor to be killed and burnt. Of such it is said, “He that taketh the sword shall perish with the sword.” We, however, suffer persecution from them for righteousness.—Also they eat the bread of idleness, doing nothing: but we work with our hands. Also they wish to be the only

teachers ; to whom it is said, Matt. xxiii, “ Woe unto you that have taken away the key of knowledge : ”¹ but among us, women teach, as well as men ; and a disciple of seven days instructs another. Also there is hardly a teacher among them that knows by heart three connected chapters of the New Testament : but among us there is scarce a man or woman who cannot repeat the text in the vulgar tongue. And because we have the true faith of Christ, and teach a holy life and doctrine, these Scribes and Pharisees, without cause, persecute us to death as they did Christ. Moreover they only say, and do not ; and bind heavy burdens on men’s shoulders, but do not move them with a finger : but we practise all we teach. Also they are more urgent in compelling the observance of the traditions of men, than of the commands of God ; as of fasts, festivals, going to church, and many other things, which are of human institution : but we only persuade men to keep the doctrine of Christ and the apostles. Also they load penitents with grievous penances : but we, after the example of Christ, say to the sinner, Go and sin no more ! and remit all his sins by the imposition of hands ; and transmit souls at death to heaven : but they send almost all souls to hell.

“ Having stated these and other points, the heretic says ; Consider which state and which faith is the more perfect, ours, or that of the Church of Rome : and make choice of it.—Thus the hearer is turned away from the catholic faith, being seduced by their errors.”²

¹ Let the reader compare on all this the conversation of the Paulikian woman, six centuries before, given p. 235 *suprà*. It is interesting to mark the identity of the witness-sayings and doings, at such an interval of space and time.

² Reiner elsewhere notices, in proof of their zeal, that a Leonist swam the river Ibsa in winter, in order to teach one of his proselytes. B. P. M. xxv. 264.

Let me add illustrations on the subject of the above extract from two other writers, nearly cotemporary with Reiner, viz. *Lucas de Tuy*, and *Ivo of Narbonne* ;—the one giving particulars of the Waldenses in *Spanish Galicia*, the other in *Lombardy* : which, as being less known, and of much interest, seem to me to deserve insertion.

1. *Lucas de Tuy*,—who flourished, Schottus observes in his Prefatory Letter to Gretzer, under Popes Gregory IX and Celestine IV, i. e. between the years 1227 and 1241, and who speaks of the Waldenses as a sect that had risen not very long before his time in Gaul,—thus notices their habit of diffusing their

AND here I conclude this Chapter :—a Chapter prolonged, in consequence of the extent and difficulty of its subject, much beyond the limits I could have desired ;

tenets, by a practice in later and modern times much and effectively followed, that of the dissemination of *religious Tracts*. (B. iii. c. 18.) “ With unheard-of wickedness, and a new plan of deceit, they wrote Tracts, and scattered them in unfrequented mountain-paths ; that the shepherds finding them might bring them to the clergy to read. It was said in them that they were written by the Son of God, and transmitted to men by the hands of holy angels. There were many catholic truths stated in them ; but, intermixed with these, certain heretical statements also ; in order that, through the sweetness of the former, the bitter poison of what was heretical might the better insinuate itself. The simple priests received and read the papers with great reverence ; and understood not they were drinking what was death to the people. The heretics took advantage of the (approbatory) words of such ignorant priests, and urged on their proselytes the favourable testimony borne by them to the Tracts. Thus deceived, many of them began to treat with contempt the confession of their sins to the priests, and the traditions and the fasts of the church. For those diabolical Tracts promised forgiveness of sins to all who might transcribe them, and to all who devoutly read them. Wherefore there was the greatest zeal to *write* them out, with such as were able to write ; and with the less educated clergy to *read* them to the people.”

In the chapter preceding, that is ch. 17, Lucas notices a particular heretic, one *Arnold*,* thus acting ; who, he says, “ had come from Gaul into Spain ; and, with the pen of a ready writer, having written out extracts from Augustine, Jerome, Isidore, and Bernard,—adding what was false, and withholding what was true,—sold or even gave them to Catholics.”† Bib. P. Max. xxv. 248.

2. *Iro of Narbonne* is related by Matthew Paris, on the year 1243, to have thus written of the Waldensian sectaries to the Archbishop of Narbonne, in an account of his flight from that city and adventures. He says, “ that being unjustly accused of heresy he fled ; that, after making circuit of many provinces, he so at length came to *Como*, and there bewailed his case to certain *Paterini* (sectaries of the Waldensian body ‡) there residing ; that on this they rejoiced, felicitating him on having suffered for righteousness’ sake, and housed and entertained him luxuriously for three months :§ that they then constrained him by their kindnesses to promise that from that time he would preach and per-

* The same that Dr. Gilly confounds, as I have before observed, with Arnold of Brescia—The Brescian Arnold was burnt at Rome, A. D. 1155. The one Lucas speaks of died at Leon in Spain, probably near a century later.

† In another chapter (xxi) Lucas notes the *joy* of heretics on being put to death : asserting that their difference in this point from *Christ*,—who, on the approach of *his* sufferings, was exceeding sorrowful even unto death,—shewed they could not belong to *Him* ; and citing Bernard’s 66th sermon on the Canticles, (a sermon already referred to by me,) wherein it was ascribed to diabolical agency. “ If induced by the Devil to commit suicide, how much rather prompted to joy by him, when put to death by others !”

‡ So in the letter of Innocent III to the Bishop of Aix, cited by me already, p. 333 Note 1, and which speaks of “ Quosdam qui *Valdenses*, Cathari, et *Patarini* dicuntur.”

§ It will be remembered that this was during the time when the Duke Ubert reigned over *Como*, *Milan*, and the adjacent country : who, being himself a determined heretic, in the Romish phrase, had made that country for a time like a *Goshen* to the persecuted *Waldenses*. See p. 340.

and for the disproportionate length of which, therefore, I must beg the indulgence of the reader.—I trust I have shown in it that, in so far as we can judge from *mere hostile evidence*,—the only evidence existing,—there was perpetuated in the *Paulikian* sect, at least from the year 653,¹ a line of WITNESSES for Christ's truth and against the apostacy of *Eastern* origin ; also, on the much more satisfactory evidence of their own writings, albeit broken and interrupted, in the *Christians of Piedmont, Switzerland, the Delphinat, and adjacent districts*, a WITNESS-line of *earlier* and *Western* origin. And let me here repeat the observation, made long since at the beginning of this Chapter,² that if the mere hostile evidence respecting the *Eastern* line seem inadequate to establish its claim to the title of Christ's Witnesses, the *Western* will of itself suffice to answer the Apocalyptic requirements. Further, we have seen that the two lines (besides frequent previous but less notable interminglings) blended together as one, both in the Cottian sub-alpine settlements and in other countries, from about the end of the xiith century ; under the thenceforth common name, for the most part, of *Waldenses*.—Now with regard to this *united* line, just as to its two *earlier* branches, the chief of the Apocalyptic characteristics of Christ's Witnesses will already, in the course of the narrative preceding, have been seen to attach to them. For example we marked in them the union of the teachers and the taught, the *olive-tree* and the *candlestick* ;—the promise men that in the Romish faith (in Petri fide) there was no salvation : that they informed him how that from nearly all the cities of Lombardy, and from many of Tuscany, they had sent scholars to Paris, there to qualify themselves, by hard study of Logic and Theology, to support their own sectarian doctrines, and confute the Apostolic faith : also that they were in the habit of sending merchants and pedlars to the fairs, with the view of perverting the minds of rich laymen, with whom they might lodge or converse. That, after this, he was passed on to members of the same sect at Milan, and other Lombard cities on the Po, with secret pass-words and signs ; till at length at Cremona he was suspected by one of their bishops, (afterwards ejected from the sect on charge of fornication,*) and thence proceeded to Aquileia, and so to Frisach."

The above is nearly a literal translation, being only slightly abbreviated. It is given by Gretzer in his Prolegomena to the anti-Waldensian writers, inserted after Lucas de Tuy in the B. P. M. xxv. 253, 254.

¹ See my remark at the top of p. 231.

² See p. 198 *suprà*.

* The reader will mark this incidental testimony to the morality of the sect.

nence of the Saviour CHRIST in their doctrine, as in that of *Christ's* own witnesses, and protestation against the doctrines of the apostacy that set Christ aside;—their simple reference to *inspired Scripture*, not tradition, as the rule of faith;—their *paucity of number*, by comparison with the great mass around them;—and their *sackcloth-robing*, or state of mourning and depression: this depression and mourning arising, at first, it might be, simply from the general apostacy of the multitude round them,¹ and the intolerance of anti-apostatic doctrine by the supreme ecclesiastical authority; afterwards, at least from the time of Claude of Turin, from direct and bitter persecution.—Nor let me pass forward without here observing on two singular illustrations of the asserted fact of these Waldenses (or rather combined Paulikians and Waldenses²) constituting the predicted Apocalyptic Witnesses, furnished us in what we read both of the Valdentic *dress*, and the Valdentic *heraldic arms*, in the Cottian sub-alpine settlements. For their dress is noted by more than one writer as the *rough sheep* or *goat-skin*:³ the which, from being *sackcloth-like* in its appearance, gave to them, (just as to the Jewish Prophets before them,⁴) agreeably with the precise predicted guise of the two typical Apocalyptic Witnesses, the identical appella-


¹ As Lot's righteous soul was *vexed* (εβασταρισθη) with the filthy conversation of the wicked.

² See p. 340 *suprà*.

³ *Walter Mapes* in his account of the *Waldenses* that he met at Rome in 1179, (an account already more than once referred to) speaks of them as travelling, "two and two, naked-footed, and clad in *coarse woollen garments*," (Faber, 271.) *Thuanus*, also, describing those of Dauphiny, says, "Their clothing is of the *skins of sheep*: they have no linen." (Milner, Cent. xiii. c. 2.)—I think I have elsewhere seen the colour noted as *black*. So the goat's wool, Cant. vi. 5.

⁴ It is said in Zechariah xiii. 4, "Neither shall they wear a rough garment." On this Kimchi says, "*sackcloth*, or a garment of hair." And Dr. A. Clarke observes; "A rough garment made of goat's hair, coarse wool, or the rough pile of the camel, was the ordinary garb of God's Prophets, and so worn also by false Prophets."—Now the *sackcloth* was often of this manufacture. So it appears from Rev. vi. 12, where it is called σακκος τριχινος, *sackcloth of hair*. Hence in Isaiah's case his prophet's *sheep-skin* garment is called *sackcloth*; "The Lord spake to Isaiah, saying, Go, loose the sackcloth from off thy loins:" Isaiah xx. 2. And as sackcloth was the emblem of *mourning* among the Jews, (see 2 Sam. iii. 31, &c.) these sheep-skins and goat-skins are also represented as a mourning dress. So in Heb. xi. 37; "They wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented."—Compare 1 Kings xix. 13, "Elias wrapped his face (εν τη μηλωτη αυτου) in his *sheep-skin*."

THE WALDENSIAN CANDLESTICK.



From Leger

tion of *sackcloth-wearers*.¹ Again the heraldic arms of the Waldenses, and their chief town *Lucerna*, was the precise Apocalyptic symbol of a *lighted candlestick* in surrounding night ; with the motto, “ *The light shineth in darkness.*”² So that in this, as in other cases, the general scripture rule, of which I have before spoken, will here appear to have had its fulfilment ; I mean that of the imagery being drawn from the *living subjects* of the prefiguration.³

Nor will that other yet unnoticed characteristic of the two Apocalyptic witnesses,—I mean the *avenging power* given them by God, *first* of smiting the land which rejected their testimony with *plagues* as often as they would, *secondly* of shutting it out from the *dews of heaven* throughout the period of their prophesying,⁴—seem inapplicable to those whom I have described as Christ’s witnesses, in the history of Christendom. Witness what was said by Luther with reference to his own days, and those of Huss, (days which fell in the *later half* of the predicted period of prophesying in sackcloth,) respecting the Turks having been avengers of the godly preachers that were *then* rejected and persecuted in Christendom :⁵ a saying equally applicable to those earlier

¹ In the Paris Bibliotheca Patrum in four volumes, at vol. iv. p. 462, the learned Editor *Combesis*, after mentioning Turrianus’ explanation of the heretical appellation *ακκαοφοροι* as if equivalent to *saccophori*, *sackcloth wearers*, and setting it aside as inapplicable, adds the words following : “ Unless they” (the ancient heretics alluded to) “ may have worn it under profession of piety or poverty, like the *Poor Men of Lyons* and the *New Manichæans*, (i. e. the Paulikians of the West) ages afterwards :” (uti post aliqua sæcula fecerunt *Pauperes de Lugduno ac novi Manichæi*.) Thus the learned Dominican Father himself makes the very remarkable application of the Apocalyptic appellation *saccophori* to the *Waldenses* and *Paulikians*.—I am not aware that this has been ever noticed before.

² See Leger’s Frontispiece ; from which I append a copy.—Muston says, p. 395, that in some of the Vaudois colonies that symbol is still seen in their churches. “ Dans quelques colonies Vaudoises on a peint au plafond, ou sur la chaire des églises, comme perpetuel souvenir de leur origine, le chandelier entouré d’étoiles, qui est l’emblème de nos vallées.”—To this also the Vaudois’ answer, given by Pilichdorf, (§ 13,) has reference : “ Non possum esse talis *Lucerna publica* propter instantes persecutiones, quia vocant me hæreticum.” Must. p. 200.

³ See Vol. i. p. 391, &c.

⁴ See p. 200 *suprà*.

⁵ Table Talk, i. 421 : “ The *Pope and Turk*,” said Luther, “ have thoroughly revenged us. Upright and true preachers the world cannot endure. Nay they hurt and murder them. Therefore they must have such as bereave them of body, soul, wealth, and honour. Oh right ! right !”—And again ; “ Huss’s death was revenged. After it the Emperor Sigismund had strange and sudden misfor-

visitations of Saxons and Lombards, Saracens and Seljukian Turks, that scourged the witness-rejecting christian world, through the *earlier half* of the 1260 days. Again the saying of Archbishop Peckham respecting England in the xivth century,¹ was notoriously applicable to the state of *all Western Christendom* throughout the *five earlier centuries* that we have passed in review : viz. that the general spiritual destitution was such, that the people might be resembled to poor and needy ones, that sought water and found none. And since on the scale of Christendom, even as of individuals, that general rule of God's moral government could not but be fulfilled, "Whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away, even that he hath," we may surely view this too as a judicial infliction on it, for its rejection of the witness borne to the truth, the light offered.—As to that further particular noted of the Apocalyptic Witnesses' avenging power, I mean of "*fire going out of their mouth to consume their adversaries,*" its fulfilment in regard of the Paulikians and Waldenses, (if I have rightly characterized them,) though future remains yet, as I conceive, still sure.² For doubtless in such case their words must have taken hold of their wilful adversaries,³ even as Jeremiah's words of fire of the Jews of his time, or the apostles' of those who rejected theirs,⁴ to condemn

tunes, being always afterwards beaten by the Turks, over whom he had before continual victories." *Ibid.*

¹ See p. 156 *suprà*.—The same *spiritual drought*, and *famine of hearing God's word*, is spoken of by a Greek monk as characterizing the state of his country, not very long after the taking of Jerusalem by the Saracens ; i. e. nearly about the time of the rise of the Paulikian sect, and early in the 1260 years period. *Bib. Patr. Paris Ed. in four Volumes, i. 1021.* And similar remarks respecting other parts of the period under review might easily be added, in exemplification.

² See p. 201 *suprà*.—As I have there given no corroborative explanation from other commentators of this *future* view of the clause referred to, let me here add two, one from the patristic expositor *Tichonius*, the other from the celebrated middle-age scholastic divine, *Thomas Aquinas*.—*Tichonius* : "Id est, si quis ecclesiam vel lædit vel lædere voluerit, precibus oris ejus divino igne aut in præsentia ad correctionem, aut in futuro sæculo ad damnationem consumetur." (*Hom. viii. in Apoc.*)—*T. Aquinas* : "Ignis exiet de ore illorum, et devorabit, &c. Quia ignis, id est scientia spiritualis, exiit de ore illorum, cui non poterunt resistere adversarii : ut Jer. xxiii. 29, et Eccles. xlvi. 1. Et devorabit, id est devorandos eos ostendet, sc. à dæmonibus, et damnandos in ignem æternum." *De Antichr. i. 49.*

³ I say *wilful*, because many doubtless of their enemies were unintentionally misled by false reports respecting them, totally to misjudge their true character.

⁴ *Matt x. 11, 15.*

and consume them at the last.—How striking, how pointed the antithesis in this intimation about them (I cannot but note it ere concluding) to the language of the Usurper Antichrist! “*We shut heaven against them,*” was his cry. “*We send upon them famine and thirst, and drought; and call fire from heaven to consume and devour them.*”¹ Such was the Papal language of curse against these heretics, as he termed them; though in reality Witnesses for Jesus. But “*These have power to shut heaven,*” said Christ, “during the days of their prophecy; *these to smite the antichristian Roman earth with every plague.*” Thus, as Luther once said, in a passage already before quoted by me,² “Did Christ judge between them whose excommunication and curse, his or theirs, should stand.”

So concludes my historical view of Christ’s Witnesses, as reaching to the times of Peter Valdes and his first Waldensian associates, or end of the xiith century. It was very much the same that presented itself to Flacius, and Bale, and Foxe, and the other Martyrologists among the early Reformers; as they looked back from their point of observation to the earlier centuries, in which Witnesses clothed in sackcloth had to bear testimony for Christ’s cause and truth.—Nor indeed did their retrospective view of the history, as Apocalyptically prefigured, here terminate. But I think it well to pause awhile for the present; because that there here begins the notable æra of the Beast from the abyss, or Papal power, taking up the sword, and commencing war, in all the plentitude of its force and fury, against these Witnesses for the Lord Jesus. It is an æra strongly marked both in the apocalyptic prediction and in history. And of it, and its memorable results, it seems desirable to treat in a separate Chapter.

¹ So in the Papal Form of Excommunication given in Martene de Rit. ii. 324; “Sicut Dominus B. Petro ejusque successoribus, cujus vicem tenemus, potestatem dedit ut quodcumque ligarent, &c,—ita illis *calum claudimus*:—et percutiat eos Dominus fame et siti donec deficiant;—et cum Diabolo et angelis ejus perpetuis ignibus tradantur,” &c.

² P. 189 *suprà*.

CHAPTER VIII.

RETROSPECTIVE VIEW, AS CONTINUED FROM THE
REFORMATION, OF THE PAPAL WILD BEAST'S
WAR AGAINST CHRIST'S WITNESSES, THEIR
DEFEAT, DEATH, AND RESURRECTION.

“And when they shall have completed¹ their testimony, the Wild Beast that is to ascend out of the abyss shall make war against them.—And he shall overcome them, and shall kill them.—And their dead bodies *shall lie*² in the broad place³ of the great city, which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, where also their Lord⁴ was crucified.—And they from⁵ the people and kindred and tongues and nations, shall see their dead bodies three days and a half; and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves. And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and send gifts one to another: because these two prophets tormented them that dwell on the earth.—And after the three days and a half⁶ the spirit of life from God entered into them: and they stood upon their feet. And great fear fell upon them that beheld them.” Apoc. xi. 7—12.

There is no indication as yet of change of the speaker, or interruption of the narrative begun by him in the preceding verses. Thus the Lord Jesus, symbolically represented a little before as descending with life-giving lustre on the Roman earth, in prefiguration of the burst of gospel-light vouchsafed by Him at the *Reformation*,

¹ ὅταν τελεσῶσι. In the authorized version it is, “When they shall have finished.” The reason and meaning of the alteration will be given presently.

² These two words are supplied in the authorized translation.

³ Πλατειᾶ, remarked on afterwards.

⁴ So Griesbach's and Tregelles' text; ὁ κυριος αυτων, *their Lord*; instead of the received reading, ὁ κυριος ἡμων, “*our Lord*!”

⁵ This instead of, “they *of* the people,” &c; the original being, εκ των λαων, &c.

⁶ The definite article is in the original, μετα τας τρεις ἡμερας.

must be considered as still addressing St. John ; and St. John as still the type on the Apocalyptic scene of the reforming fathers.¹ What the speaker *now* directs John's regard to, (of course *retrospectively* as before,) is the *second* part of his Witnesses' previous eventful history ; including *the Papal wild Beast's war against them,—their defeat and slaughter,—and their resurrection.*

I. THE PAPAL WILD BEAST'S WAR AGAINST CHRIST'S WITNESSES.

“ And when they shall have completed their testimony, the Wild Beast that is to ascend from the abyss shall make war against them.”

I shall not here stop to prove that the *Wild Beast from the abyss* symbolized the ten kingdoms of Papal Christendom, or the Popes heading them. A fitter occasion will occur afterwards. Suffice it for the present to observe that the definite article indicates that but *one* wild Beast was figured in the Apocalyptic imagery as of this infernal origin ; that the ascription of the same origin to the seven-headed and ten-horned wild Beast which in Apoc. xvii. 8. appeared ridden by the Harlot, or apostatized Romish Church, marks *it* as the actual one intended ;² and that this last is also identified by many indubitable marks with the seven-headed and ten-horned wild Beast, which, in the vision of chapter xiii, was seen by the Evangelist rising out of the sea of the Gothic inundation.³ Its history was deemed too important to be here described parenthetically, or in passing ; and was made in fact the subject of those two supplemental visions of chapters xiii and xvii, to which I have just referred. Thus far however the Evangelist might presume respecting it, on this its first mention to him ;

¹ See pp. 110, 111 *suprà*.

² “The wild beast that thou sawest was, and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit:” *μελλει αναβαινει εκ της αβυσσος*. Its appearance is described in verse 3 ; “ I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And on the woman's forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.”

³ “ I saw a wild beast rise out of the sea having seven heads and ten horns.” xiii. 1.—The parallel will be drawn out in my Comment on Chapter xiii.

viz. that it was some persecuting power that would comprehend and head those Gentile or paganized christians that had been spoken of just before as occupiers of the outer court of the mystic temple, or professing church, through the period of the Witnesses' prophesying :¹ also that it was the same ten-horned wild Beast that had been represented long previously to the Prophet Daniel in vision, as constituting the last and most fearful form of the Roman Empire, in its character of persecutor.²—Of this wild Beast, then, it was said by the Angel ; “ When they (the Witnesses) shall have completed their testimony, the wild Beast that is to ascend from the abyss shall make war against them.” In the *first* clause of which sentence the *time* and *occasion* of the war is noted ; in the *next* the *war itself*.

1. The *time* and *occasion*.—“ When *they shall have completed their testimony*, ἕταν τελεσωσι την μαρτυριαν αυτων, the Wild Beast shall make war against them.” To explain the meaning of the clause, “ *When they shall have completed,*” (ἕταν τελεσωσι,) &c, and shew how it marks *time* and *occasion*, will need a little careful critical investigation : nor can we proceed satisfactorily to our historical inquiry without in the first place deciding on it.

The truth is that few clauses in prophetic Scripture have occasioned expositors so much labour and trouble as this. In our authorized English version it is translated, “ And when they shall have *finished* their testimony ;” as if referring chronologically to the *end of the 1260 years* of the witnessing. And in so far as the clause itself is concerned this is, I admit, the most natural mode of translating and understanding it. But, comparing it with the *context*, it seems to me equally plain that such *cannot* be here the intended meaning. For in the first place it would imply either that the wild Beast from the abyss never made war before against

¹ “ The court that is without the temple is given to the Gentiles ; and the Holy City shall they tread under foot forty and two months.” xi. 2.

² Dan. vii. 7 ; “ I saw a fourth beast dreadful and terrible, and it had ten horns.

them ; a supposition contrary to what is said elsewhere of this wild Beast both in Ch. xiii and Ch. xvii :¹—or that all its long previous wars against them are here passed over in silence ;² an omission scarcely credible, considering the importance of the subject.—Further there is this yet stronger objection to the above-stated translation, that it makes the 1260 years expire too soon. For the Witnesses' 1260 days coincide evidently with the Beast's 1260 days ; so as to make the latter end when the former do :³ whereas at the epoch in question the Beast is as evidently quite at the height of his triumph and power. Moreover it makes them expire a considerable time before the sounding of the seventh Trumpet. For after the statement (on this version) of the *finishing* of the 1260 years prophetic period, in the verse before us, there is represented as *subsequently* occurring the wild Beast's war against the Witnesses, their death, their resurrection, their ascension,—all consecutive events, not cotemporaneous,—then the effects and development of an earthquake commencing about the time of the ascension of the Witnesses,—then the termination of the second woe,—then (not immediately, but after an interval)⁴ the sounding of the seventh Trumpet. Now I believe no commentator supposes the 1260 years period to expire before this Trumpet's sounding.—Yet once more it will appear both from subsequent Apocalyptic predictions, and from Daniel's prophetic vision of the same wild Beast, that the expiration of this *time times and half time*, or 1260 years, of his power over

¹ In Apoc. xiii. 7 ; “And it was given to him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them:” compared with Apoc. xii. 17, which states the Dragon's object in raising up this wild Beast, to be that of making war with the remnant of the sun-clothed woman's seed, “which kept the commandments of God, and had the testimony of Jesus Christ.” In Apoc. xvii. 6 : “And I saw the woman,” her that rode the seven-headed ten-horned wild beast, and had its co-operation evidently in the act, “drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.”

² So Vitringa, p. 635 ; “Cave ita accipias post finem demum triennii et semestris belluam hanc bellum facturam esse sanctis, et eos victuram. Contrarium enim liquet ex *αναλογία* omnium prophetiarum hujus libri :—sed bestiam sub finem, vel post finem triennii et semestris, vires suas singulari modo esse exercituram, et extremo quidem sed terribili conatu, contra testes Christi.” ³ Apoc. xi. 2, 3.

⁴ Apoc. xi. 14 : “The second woe is past : the third woe cometh *quickly*.”

the saints, will be marked by a catastrophe abundantly more fearful than that of the mere fall of a tenth part of the Papal city or empire. There is then to result the preparation, at least, for the speedy destruction of the whole of the Great City, and giving of the body of the Beast to the burning flame.¹—To my own mind these objections appear *absolutely decisive* against understanding the phrase *ὅταν τελεσῶσι*, to signify the *end* of the 1260 years of the Witnesses prophesying in sackcloth.

It is not needful that I should enumerate the renderings that have been proposed, instead of this, by different expositors; as that of *Mede*, “When they shall be about finishing;” or of *Daubuz*, “Whilst they shall perform their testimony;” or that of *Mr. Faber*, distinguishing between the *μαρτυρία*, or *testimony* of the Witnesses, and that of their *prophesying in sackcloth*.² Objections, grammatical or of some other nature, occur to all of them.³ It will be better to proceed at once to state what

¹ Apoc. xvi. 17: “And the seventh angel poured out his vial in the air.—And there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth; so mighty an earthquake and so great. And the great city was divided into three parts; and great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath.” The which is followed by a declaration, Apoc. xviii. 2; “And the angel cried, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit.” Again, verse 8; “Her plagues shall come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire:” and xix. 20; “The Beast was taken, and cast into the lake of fire.”

So again Daniel vii. 21, &c; “I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.” Also verse 11; “I beheld till the Beast was slain, and his body given to the burning flame.”

² “To *prophesy in sackcloth*,” says Mr. F. “denotes to preach the gospel in a despised and depressed condition: to *bear testimony* to the truths of the gospel denotes to suffer martyrdom for them.” Sac. Cal. iii. 36.

³ The grammatical rule which requires that, in the conjunction of the aorist subjunctive with the particles of time *ὅταν*, *επειδαν*, (*ὄτε αν*, *επειδη αν*) &c., there should be “the leading idea of an *action complete* or *concluded*,” (Matthiæ’s Greek Grammar, p. 846) is in neither *Mede*’s nor *Daubuz*’ renderings attended to.

As to *Mr. Faber*’s, the following obvious, and I believe, insuperable objections unite to set it altogether aside. 1. *Μαρτυρία* is no where used in Scripture *distinctively* as a testimony unto death. St. John was but an exile in Patmos, and never suffered martyrdom. Yet he speaks of himself as suffering *δια την μαρτυριαν Ιησους Χριστου*. Origen’s restrictive sense of the word, to which Mr. F. refers as authority, seems to have come into vogue not till about the time when that father lived;* and it is surely but a most insufficient authorization for such a version.—2. Even admitting Origen’s restrictive sense, *μαρτυρία* would mean not

* Bishop Kaye on Tertullian, p. 137, observes that in *Tertullian*’s time the use of the word *μαρτυς* was not so restricted.

I believe to be the true meaning ; and which I hope will approve itself to the reader as such, from its satisfying all the requirements of both text and context.

Let it be remembered then respecting *τελεω* and the accusative following, when designative of any function *often* to be performed, and each time involving *various acts* in detail, — *first*, that the verb indicates not the mere *finishing*, but the *going through*, and *complete performing* of the function, as Daubuz *in so far* justly expounds it : *next*, that the thing spoken of as completed may be not the *whole official course* of the functionary, but his accomplishment or completion of the function, in all its several parts, on each or any one occasion.¹ For example, in reference to the passage, (Gal. v. 16,) *Ου μη τελεσητε τας επιθυμιας της σαρκος*, “Ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh,” it is clear that each time that a man *completed* the sinful lust, by first indulging it in his mind, and then carrying it out into action,² he might be fitly said *τελεσαι επιθυμιαν αυτη*, to fulfil his fleshly lust ; yet not so as to in-

the whole previous life of a Christian, faithful among the faithless, but simply the crowning act of testimony, punished with death. Transferring which view to a *community*, or *church*, the word *μαρτυρια* could only signify that crowning act of its testimony, of which the consequence and punishment might be its destruction as a church and community ; not all its previous existence as a faithful church for hundreds of years before, so as Mr. Faber would here construe it to mean. 3. This last argument applies *à fortiori*, and *ex abundantia*, against Mr. F.’s historical explanation : because not only does it make the *μαρτυρια* to include that which in Origen’s sense of the word it cannot include, but actually to exclude that to which alone Origen would apply it. For it is not till after the witnesses *finishing* their *μαρτυρια* (such is Mr. Faber’s as well as the authorized version of the word *τελεσωσι*) that the Beast is said to make war upon them ; which war, consequently, whether of longer or shorter duration, intervenes between Mr. F.’s ending of the witnesses’ *μαρτυρια*, and their conquest by the Beast and death. What if (assuming Origen’s sense of the word) it were to be said of the body of the Diocletian martyrs, that it was *after they had finished their testimony and martyrdom* that Diocletian issued certain edicts of persecution against Christians, under which some years after these self-same martyrs suffered death ? 4. The clause, “And they, my *two μαρτυρες*, shall *prophesy 1260 days in sackcloth*,” implies their being Christ’s *μαρτυρες*, or witnesses, *all* the 1260 days of their prophesying : for how could they do the thing, and for the time assigned them, in the character of Christ’s witnesses, if during a great part of that time they were in that identical character non-existent and defunct ?

¹ It is in this way that *τελεω* has sometimes a noun of *time* following it, designative of the whole period occupied by the several parts or acts of the performance. So 2 Chron. xxx. 22 ; *Συνετελεσαν την εορτην των αζυμων επτα ημερας*. And Eusebius ; (Notes 113 B.) *Επι τρισι και τεσσαρακοντα ετεσι την επισκοπην εκτελεσαντα*, in some copies. Similarly Phil. i. 6 ; “Having begun a good work in you, *επιτελεσει* *αχρις ημερας Χρισθ*.”

² Compare James i. 15 : “When lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin,” &c.

dicating the termination at that time of his whole career of the service of lust and sin. Again, of the *Jewish priests* it is said in Heb. ix. 6, “They enter the Tabernacle continually, *τας λατρειας επιτελωντες*, *fulfilling their services*, or priestly functions.” The which, day by day, included several acts;—the receiving incense, carrying it with altar-fire into the holy place and burning it, kindling or snuffing the lamps, &c:—after the whole of which was accomplished, on any one defined occasion, then it might be said that the priest had fulfilled his service, *ετελεσε την λατρειαν αυτη* yet not so as to have finally then ceased *λατρευειν*, or to have resigned thereon his priestly office.¹—Just in the same way, supposing a repetition more or less frequent of their *μαρτυρια*, or testimony, required of the two Witnesses of the Apocalypse,—so soon as they might once have gone through the several component parts or acts of that testimony, so soon it might be said of them that they had *fulfilled* or *completed their testimony*: yet not so as to imply that their whole period of testifying was at an end, or that they thereupon ceased to be any longer Christ’s Witnesses.²

¹ Τελεω is a verb peculiarly applied to the fulfilment of ministerial or religious offices. So Philo, very like the apostle, though prior in time, of the Jewish high priests; *Αρχιερευς κατα της νομης ευχας τε και θυσιας τελων καθ’ εκαστην ημεραν*. Also *Eriphanius* with reference to the celebration of sabbath assemblies, *Εν τοις σαββασι τας συναξεις επιτελωσι*. *Epi.* i. p. 1107; and *Eusebius*, *E. H.* x. 3, of the fulfilment of ministerial *διακονιας*; just as the classical writers of *συνοδου*, *πανηγυρεις*, *ελευσινια*, *αγωνας*, &c.

Indeed *Eusebius* has passages in which the very word *μαρτυριον* is the accusative after *τελεω*: as *Ecc.* *Hist.* vi. 1; *Λαμπρα μεν των υπερ ευσεβειας αθλητων κατα παντα τροπον εν απασαις ταις εκκλησιαις απετελειτο μαρτυρια* and again viii. 12; *Τα μεν κατα Καισαρειαν επιτελεσθεντα μαρτυρια εφ’ ολοις τοις διωγμω χρονις τοιαυτα*. And as he does not always confine the use of the word *μαρτυριον*, or *μαρτυρια*, to martyrdoms *unto death*, (see his *E. H.* vi. 41.) as *τελειωι μαρτυρες* is the distinctive phrase used by him of martyrs unto death, and as the periods here referred to by him were illustrated by other confessings for Christ, besides that by death, I might perhaps adduce the phrases, *απετελειτο μαρτυριον*, *επιτελεσθεντα μαρτυρια*, as meant to include the witnessing of confessors who were still living, and likely to renew it. In such case the parallel would be very striking with the passage of the text, as I am now explaining it. But *generally* *Eusebius* (like *Origen*) does mean by *μαρτυριον*, martyrdom unto death; and therefore I do not insist on the parallel.

² In a Paper published in the third volume of the Investigator, p. 185, and which set forth substantially the same view of the Witnesses’ Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, as that which is here advocated, I proposed a somewhat different mode of construing the *δταν τελεσωσιν*; viz. as signifying, “When the witnesses *shall have been fulfilling* their testimony.” And that this interpretation

But what then the constituent parts or acts of this μαρτυρία? Obviously a protestation for Christ against each of the successively developed and enforced antichristian errors of the apostacy; errors as defined, not by a commentator so as to suit his own hypothesis of interpretation, but by the Apocalyptic prophecy itself: viz. the *sacramental error*, allusively noted in the viith chapter, whereby the opus operatum of the sacrament was made the source of life and light to the soul, instead of Christ's Spirit;—the substitution of the *mediatorship of departed saints*, which chapter viii hints at, in place of Christ;—the *idolatry, dæmon-worship, sorceries, thefts, fornications, and murders* of the apostate church and system, specified in chapter ix;—finally the *support and headship* of the system by the *Romish Church and its Bishop on the seven hills*, with his *seven thunders* and *voice of Antichrist*, figured or described in chapters x, xiii, and also xvii.—These are the successively developed characteristics of the apostacy noted in the Apocalypse. The protestation of Christ's witnesses had of course to embrace them all. And so soon as it might have done this, so soon, I conceive, they might be said to have *made complete their testimony*, in the intended sense of the phrase before us: (in effect this is very much the interpretation given to it by the ancient father Hippolytus, in his Tract on Antichrist: ¹) although by no means as implying the close of the whole period of witnessing assigned them; or their personal or official extinction as Christ's witnesses.

was not unaccordant with the Greek idiom was shown by many examples; if meant to betoken *habit*, in the sense of *whenever, as often as*. On looking, however, into history I found that the Papacy did not make war on Christ's Witnesses *as often as* they fulfilled their testimony; nor in fact until the xiiith century. So the explanation was set aside; and, in its place, the modification now given adopted: it having been suggested to me in the course of the same historic inquiries, as stated afterwards.

¹ He says; *Και όταν κηρύξωσι ταυτὰ πάντα* (that is, all necessary points of forewarning respecting Antichrist's coming and character) *παρα τῆς Διαβολῆς ἐν βρομφαῖς πεισυνταί' και πληρωσασι την μαρτυριαν αυτων*. Bib. Pat. (Paris, 1624.) ii. 351.

I have already observed, p. 198, that Hippolytus' idea of the two witnesses was that they would be *Enoch and Elias*, with *St. John* superadded; and that he understood the predicted three and a half years as years *literally* to be taken.

Was the epoch then of their completing this a marked epoch in the actual history of those in whom we have thought to trace Christ's witnesses? And, if so, did war from the Papacy against them mark its arrival? Such in fact was the case: indeed so strikingly so, that it is the palpable coincidence of this epoch of completion in the witnesses' testimony with that of the Papal war commencing against them, that, without my thinking or seeking for it, *forced* this interpretation on my mind.—From early times we have seen that the witnesses both of Eastern and Western origin made protestation against the *sacramental error* and the *mediatorship of saints*, setting forth *Christ* as the source of life, through faith in Him, *Christ* as the only mediator and intercessor for sinful men: also against the *idolatries, sorceries, thefts, fornications, murders*, which characterized the apostate priesthood and church of professing Christendom.¹ But against *Rome, Papal Rome*, as the predicted *head of the apostacy*, and the *Babylon and Harlot of the Apocalypse*, they for centuries protested not. Nothing meets us nearer to a protestation on this point, than the Paulikian saying, "We are *Christians, ye Romans*,"² until we come to Berenger's notable statement, made in the xith century, "that the Romish Church was a church of malignants, and its see not the apostolic seat, but that of Satan."³ And that was but an insulated voice; and made by one who shrunk from acting the confessor. It was a hint however not lost. A century later came the time of Peter Valdes and his disciples. The Noble Lesson, written probably by one of them, as we have seen, somewhere between 1160 and 1180, marks in what it says of Antichrist a *preparation* of mind to make the great step, and recognise the predicted Babylon, Harlot,

¹ See on this p. 206 *suprà*, and the historical summaries beginning pp. 271, 338, &c.

² See p. 274.

³ See p. 253 *suprà*.—It is remarked on by Tissington, a Romish writer of the xith century, as a *Berengarium somnium*, a *day-dream of Berenger's*, that at the expiration of the 1000 years from Christ's death Satan was loosed, and his loosing evidenced in the promulgation of before unequalled heresies and errors by the *Romish Church*,—specially that of transubstantiation. Faber on the Waldenses, p. 394.

and Antichrist in Rome and the Papacy.¹ Ere the termination of the xiith century, this step of advance was actually made by the Waldenses, the orthodox associated Paulikians, and other sectaries.² Then the Papacy, —of which previously the separate members alone, acting independently of the Head, had moved against heretics,—roused itself collectively in the 3rd Lateran General Council of 1179, and declared war against them. As Mede observes in one place, though without

¹ “We ought to be well advised when Antichrist shall come. But, according to Scripture, there are *many Antichrists* ;” a statement pointing to the *Romish Church*, (so I inferred from the representations previously drawn by the writer of its practices and doctrines,) as those of a soul-destroying apostate church.—See p. 344.

² See Reinerius’ testimony to this effect given by me, p. 324, Note 3.

My friend, the Rev. W. Digby, thinks that the Witnesses could not be said to have *completed* the details of their testimony, until they had set forth the doctrine of *justification by faith alone*, as at the Reformation. And hence he assigns the Beast’s war against them, ending in their death, to an epoch subsequent to the Reformation; the same epoch in fact, about A. D. 1668, that is advocated by Mr. Faber. The historical difficulties in the way of this solution are great, indeed I believe insuperable; and will be stated in the course of this chapter.—As to his objection to my view of the time of their making their testimony complete, I make this reply;—that I believe that which is the *essence* of the doctrine of *justification by faith alone* to have been held and propounded by *Augustine* and the most eminent of his followers, downwards, though not in the *forensic* sense. So *Luther* himself judged. “No sophist,” says he, “was ever able to understand these words, ‘*The just shall live by faith* ;’ neither did the Fathers of the Church understand them, *St. Austine excepted*.” And in another place; “The best and chiefest sentences in *St. Austine* are these, ‘Sins are forgiven, not that they are no more present, but in that they are not imputed.’ And again, ‘The law as to them is fulfilled, when that is pardoned which is not fulfilled and performed.’” Table Talk, ch. i. and xxx. Similarly *Melancthon*, refers to *Augustine* as having held the doctrine. (See his Works, Vol. iii. Fol. Ed.) And so Prince George of Anhalt; (ap. Seckendorf, iii. 507, 509;) citing from his *De Spiritu et Literâ*, c. 13, “*Colligimus non justificari hominem præceptis bonæ vitæ, nisi per fidem Jesus Christi; hoc est non lege operum, sed lege fidei; non literâ sed spiritu, non factorum memoriâ sed gratiâ gratiâ.*” And from his Tract. 43 on John; “*Quòd rejiciantur qui non fuerint credituri fide, quâ solâ possent à peccatorum obligatione liberari.*” And he observes further that *Augustine’s* arguments against the Pelagians of his day were precisely applicable to the opponents of the Lutheran doctrines; “*ut in articulo de justificatione coram Deo, de causâ nostræ salutis, de lege, de viribus liberi arbitrii, de humanis meritis, de gratiâ Dei, et remissione peccatorum, de fide, de bonis operibus, et si qui alii articuli cùm his cohærent.*”

On *Claude of Turin’s* correct view of *justification by faith*, see my p. 221, Note 4 *suprà*; on that of the *Lyonnese Church* in the 9th century, the extract at p. 225; on the *Paulikians’* p. 303; again on *Wicliff’s*, Le Bas, p. 208, &c.—The truth seems to me this, that the Augustinian doctrines of grace involved that of justification and forgiveness, freely and gratuitously, on account of the merit of Christ’s redemption, Christ’s blood, Christ’s righteousness; though the *forensic view* of the matter set forth by *Luther* brought it into much clearer and fuller light. (See too Rel. Tr. Soc. Hist. Ch. vi. 422.)

any reference to the clause or the interpretation before us ; “ Never before this time (i. e. the xiith century) had suspicion arisen of the Papacy being Antichrist.”¹ And, in another ; “ The Beast made not war against the witnesses immediately from the commencement of his existence, but in the xiith (*the same xiith*) century : at the which time the war *was* made by him against both Albigenes, Waldenses, and saints of Christ called, as it might be, by whatever other name.”²

2. And thus we come to consider, secondly, *the war itself*.

Let me premise that the delay of this war until the time we speak of, is a thing not to be wondered at. It resulted almost necessarily from the circumstance of the gradual growth and development of the Papal Antichrist. —First, and as regards *Rome*, not until its supremacy was established over every national *church* in apostate Christendom, and the circulation transmitted from it, as from head to members, could Rome consider itself identified with the prevalent superstitions every where, as part and parcel of its own greatness and wealth. Not until its supremacy was established over each *state* in Christendom, and the temporal power subjugated to the spiritual, could it command the secular sword to strike down what it called heresy or heretic. Now the Roman *pretensions* to all this supremacy bore date as early as the 6th or 7th

¹ “ Nondum enim Romanum Pontificem esse magnum illum, et *κυριως* dictum Antichristum suspicati sunt; sed alium triennem et scemestrem expectabant.” He adds; “ Neque ante hoc tempus (A. D. 1120) quicquam ex omni Christianorum memoria auditum fuisse crediderim de Papatu, magno illo et *κυριως* dicto Antichristo.” Works, pp. 721, 722. So Bishop Hurd; “ Mr. Mede seems to have proved that the true doctrine of Antichrist was, and was intended to be, a mystery or secret till the xiith century.” A statement quoted and observed on by Maitland, both in his Enquiry, p. 77, and his Remarks on the Christian Guardian, p. 95.

² “ Bellum autem isthoc non statim ab initio suo gessit Bestia, sed postquam jam ad *ακμην* suam pervenerat, currente seculo à Christo nato duodecimo. Prima ejus expeditio incubuit in Albigenes et Waldenses, et si quo alio nomine tunc appellati sunt veri Christi cultores.” Works p. 503.—So Waddington, p. 356, after relating the burning of the Orleanist Canons in 1022, observes; “ In this barbarous transaction we have found no proof of *papal* interference; nor indeed have we discovered any very important pontifical edicts for the extirpation of heresy earlier than the reign of Alexander III, A. D. 1163.”

century. But their *establishment* required time and occasion. In the ixth century the question of the independency of *Bishops* was brought to issue against them, in the contest between Pope Nicholas I. and Hincmar.¹ In the xith, and beginning of the xiith, the battle of the investitures with the German *Emperors* terminated mainly in the Papal favor.² The monster, the *Beast from the abyss*, now appeared in his maturity :³ the superstitions and corruptions of apostate Christendom were his very life-blood ; the horns of the ten kingdoms, growing from his head, his instruments of destruction against opposers : and thenceforth woe to the blasphemous unbeliever or heretic, that might raise a voice against him.—Further, and as regards the *witnessing body* for Christ, not until this completed and palpable identification of *Rome* with the corruptions and apostacy of Christendom, could it be supposed that their duty would seem clear, as they had been before testifying against particular errors of the apostacy, so now to protest against *ROME* itself, as the *center, source, and head of the apostacy*.—But then the duty *was* clear. Hence, after the prior and half-suppressed warning-voice from Berenger, the suspicion, and soon the deliberate judgment and preaching of the early Waldenses against Papal Rome, as the head of all evil in the church, the predicted Beast from the abyss, the Apocalyptic Babylon, and Antichrist.⁴ The charge was made, as we have seen, just about the close of the xiith century : and coincidentally with it, or nearly so, the wild Beast, now thoroughly prepared, turned, as might have been expected, his fierce rage against these witnesses for Christ, and made war upon them.⁵

¹ Waddington, c. xiv. p. 251. ² Ibid. c. xvii. p. 308. See also Mosheim.

³ Thus Gibbon, xi. 152, notices the æra of Innocent III as that of the meridian of papal greatness. And so also Mede, as cited in a Note just preceding.

⁴ See the Discussion at Carcassone in 1207, and also Reiner in a passage just before referred to, given, p. 324.

⁵ Muston, p. 321, quotes *Thuanus* writing thus as to Rome's dealing with heretics ; " Sanguini semper parvitum est donec ad tempora Waldensium perventum : " a statement to the same effect as Mede's quoted before by me :—adding however from Boyer ; " Depuis ce tems là on n'a cessé de les persecuter, et de leur faire la guerre : " the very Apocalyptic phrase.

It does not need that I describe at any length the proceedings of the war. Its earlier actions are traceable in the Councils of the xiith and xiiith centuries. First in a Council held at Tours, A. D. 1163, Pope Alexander III, after noticing the detestable Albigensian heresy that had spread like a cancer from Toulouse into the various provinces of Gaul, interdicts all from yielding the heretics refuge, and from communicating with them in buying and selling, or in the solace of human conversation.¹ Next followed the decree of the 3rd Lateran Council, A. D. 1179, (a *general* Council, under the same Pope, of Western Christendom,) against both Cathari, Patareni, Publicani, and heretics of other appellation: pronouncing anathema on them and their followers: and forbidding that any should harbour them while alive, or when dead give them christian burial.² In 1183 a Bull of Lucius III, Alexander's successor, was issued; in the purport of which the Emperor Frederic is said to have expressly coincided; denouncing anathema against Cathari, Patareni, Arnaldistæ, and those who called themselves Humiliati, or Poor Men of Lyons: their favorers to be given up for punishment to the secular arm, after prior degradation if of the order of clergy; and *inquisition* (a fearful word now first broached) to be carried on, for their more effectual detection and suppression.³ In 1198 Innocent III succeeded to the Papedom; and instantly shewed what was to be one chief characteristic of his reign, by Epistles written to various prelates in the first year of his pontificate, charging them to gird themselves for the work of extirpation, and to employ, if necessary, the arms both of princes and people.⁴ Then followed his mission of *Legates*, assisted by the Spaniard *Dominic*, as *Inquisitors* into the heretical pravity of the district of Toulouse: then, at a few years interval, the proclamation of a *Crusade*, with all its horrors,⁵

¹ Harduin vi. ii. 1597.

² *Ib.* 1683.

³ *Ib.* 1878.

⁴ "This last suggestion," says Dean Waddington, p. 357, "was provident. The populace might sometimes be excited to an act of outrage, when the *authorities* were neutral in the quarrel."

⁵ Take what follows as a specimen. "When the crusaders were on the point

against the heretics. The institution of the Franciscan and Dominican orders furnished a supply of instruments well fitted to carry out the schemes of inquisition and of blood.¹ The 4th Lateran General Council, in 1215, re-urged and sanctioned all former plans for the extirpation of heresy: the *secular* powers being expressly subordinated to the *spiritual* for the purpose; vassals absolved from their allegiance, in case of any secular lord, dependent or supreme, refusing;² and crusaders against the heretics rewarded with every the same indulgence and privilege as the Crusaders to the Holy Land. That of Narbonne,³ and then that of Toulouse followed: in which, besides other methods of *detection*, even *children* were compelled on oath to denounce all whom they might know as heretics; and, besides other methods of *suppression*, the Holy Scriptures, that dreaded source of light, were strictly interdicted to the laity.⁴ I shall but allude further, in passing, to the subsequent anti-heretical Councils of Arles, of Narbonne again, and of Tarragona in 1234, 1235, 1242;⁵ to Gregory the 9th's ferocious Bull against

of storming Beziers, some one inquired how the catholics were to be distinguished from the heretical inhabitants in the massacre about to take place. 'Kill them all,' replied Arnold a Cistercian, who happened to be present; 'God will know his own.' His advice appears to have been followed; and about 7000 of all persuasions suffered." Ibid 358.

¹ So Mosheim, xiii. 2. 2. 26; "Binæ hæ familiæ labantem ecclesiæ Romanæ fortunam hæreticis explorandis et extirpandis mirificè fulciebant." He says elsewhere, (ib. 24) that they did for the support of the Romish Church in the xiith century what the Jesuits did for it in the xvith.

² "Si Dominus temporalis, requisitus et monitus ab ecclesiâ, terram suam purgare neglexerit ab hac hæreticâ fœditate, per metropolitanum excommunicationis vinculo innodetur. Et si satisfacere contempserit intrâ annum, significetur hoc Summo Pontifici; ut extunc ipse vassallos ab ejus fidelitate denunciaret absolutos, et terram exponat catholicis occupandam, qui eam exterminatis hæreticis sine ullâ contradictione possideant. . . . salvo jure domini principalis, *dummodo super hoc ipse nullum præstet obstaculum*; eâdem nihilo minus lege servatâ circa eos qui non habent dominos principales." Hard. vii. 19. The reader should mark how the *suzerains*, as well as inferior chiefs, were included.

³ A. D. 1227. Hard. vii. 148.

⁴ "Prohibemus etiam ne libros Veteris Testamenti aut Novi laici permittantur habere; nisi forte Psalterium vel Breviarium pro divinis officiis, aut Horas beatae Mariæ aliquis ex devotione habere velit. Sed ne præmissos libros habeant in vulgari translatione arctissimè inhibemus." Cap. 14. Hard. vii. 178. The Council was held in 1229.

⁵ Harduin vii. 250, 349. In this of Tarragona the *Insabbatati*, *Valdenses*, and *Pauperes de Lugduno* are particularized.—Of the same date is Innocent the IVth's Constitution "for the extirpation of the tares of heresy," addressed to the Lombard Princes. Ib. 354.

heretics in 1236;¹ and, nearly cotemporarily, the edicts of the Emperor Frederic II.²—The fact of the commencement of this Papal anti-Witness war is strongly marked in European history.³ The Papacy, and all Western Christendom under its leading, had evidently entered on it as a *war of extermination* against all whom it might adjudge heretics: against the Waldenses and associated Albigenses pre-eminently; those whom we have seen reason to regard as pre-eminently *Witnesses for Jesus*.

II. We were to consider THE DEFEAT AND DEATH OF THE WITNESSES.

The progress of the Papal war against them, in the xiith and two following centuries, has been already sketched in my exposition of what is said in Apoc. ix. 21, of *murders* as one of the sins chargeable on the men of Western Christendom, before and after the destruction of Constantinople by the Turkish woe.⁴ In fact persecution followed the Waldenses into all their missions and settlements: not in Piedmont and Dauphiny alone; but in Spain and in Calabria, in France and in Flanders, in Germany and in Bohemia. Every where the blood-hound spirit of the Inquisition, even though the *Holy Office* might not have been regularly organized in the country, pursued and tracked them: and the *Wild Beast from the abyss*, or Papal power acting on and ruling the secular in Western Europe, adjudged them

¹ M'Crie's Italy. p. 4.

² Ib. p. 5. In a Letter of this Frederic, heretics were condemned to the *fire*. But it was allowed to the Bishops to shew mercy, where they thought proper; "provided the *tongues of those who should be pardoned were cut out*, so that they might not again blaspheme." Ib. p. 6.

³ The Jesuit Gretzer, in his *Prolegomena in Lucæ Tudensis Succedaneos*, has a chapter on the measures "quibus sectæ Waldensium, nimium sese diffundenti, obviam itum sit," i. e. in the xiith and xiiith centuries, which he thus sums up:—1st, the zeal and labours of Dominic and the Dominicans:—2, the Inquisition:—3, the Councils; specially the 3rd and 4th Lateran:—4, the Pontifical Constitutions against heretics:—5, the anti-heretical Crusades:—6, the imperial laws, specially of Frederic II; whereby, among other enactments, heretics themselves were adjudged (as persons guilty of *worse than treason*) to *infamy, confiscation, death*, and, if obstinate, death by *public burning*; also *their favorites* excluded from *office*, as well as from admission into courts of justice, either as witnesses or suitors; and, if temporal lords, condemned to *deprivation of their lands and territories*, which were to be abandoned to catholic invaders. B. P. Max. xxv. 256.

⁴ See pp. 19—22, and 27, 28, *suprà*.

to condign punishment. Nor was it against Waldenses only; but against those who, whether off-shoots derived directly from them, or not,¹ were inspired with the same spirit of witnessing for Christ:—against Wicliff and the Wicliffites, more especially in England,² and Huss and the Hussites in Bohemia.—It was marvellous, considering the might arrayed against them, that these witnesses endured as they did. Through not the xiiith only, but the xivth and the xvth centuries also, in spite of racks and prisons, of the sword and of the flame, their voice was still raised in protestation against the lies of Popery, and for the truth as it is in Jesus.³ At length, however, as the xvth century drew to a close, after a furious renewal of crusades against the Waldenses of Dauphiny and Piedmont, and the purer surviving section of the Hussites in Bohemia, the attainment of the Papal object seemed at hand, and victory nearer and more near within its grasp.—It was just what had been predicted. For, “The wild Beast from the abyss shall make war on them,” was not the whole of the prophecy. It had been added; “And he shall conquer them: and he shall kill them.”

¹ It is said by Leger, (*Hist. des Vaud.* Part i. ch. 2, p. 19,) that *Lollard*, a Waldensian pastor, went to London, and there disseminated Waldensian or Gospel principles; that after him rose *Wicliff*; whose disciples were called from him (not, as Southey suggests, p. 206, from *lollen*, to sing) *Lollards*.—Comenius, in his *History of the Bohemian Brethren*, (p. 264,) similarly speaks of Wicliff as a spiritual ally of the Waldenses: “*Viclefus à Waldensibus adjutus dicatur* ;” adding also, “*qui Hussium nostrum excitavit*.”—So too the Papal writers speak of Wicliff as an off-shoot of Waldism.

On *Huss's* connexion with Wicliff, see further Southey's *Book of Church* p. 228, who states that Lord Cobham sent copies of Wicliff's writings into Bohemia.

Milner represents this Lollard to have been a converted Franciscan; and to have first preached to the English in Guienne, then an English Province under Edward III.—And let me observe here that *Lollard* was not the only Inquisitor Monk changed from a persecutor to a convert. *Echard*, a Dominican, is particularly noted about the year 1330. After persecuting to the death he enquired, was convinced, and joined the Waldensian Brethren; then preached, and was martyred at Heidelberg. See Milner, *Cent.* xiii. c. 4. p. 557.

² For the form of a Wicliffite's execution, see Southey, *Book of the Church*, p. 211.

³ “In England and Scotland the disciples of Wicliff, stigmatized by the title of *Lollards*, continued to inveigh against the despotic laws of the Pontiffs, and licentious manners of the clergy. And the Waldenses, though persecuted and oppressed on all sides and from all quarters, raised their voices from their remote vallies and hiding-places, whither they were driven by the violence of their enemies.” Mosheim on the xvth century, 2. 3. 2. See also *Le Bas' Life of Wicliff*, p. 430—434, on the continuance of the Lollards' witnessing through the reign of Henry VII; i. e. up to the year 1510.

And thus we are brought to a point in the witnesses' history, retrospectively sketched for his servant's consideration by the Angel-Spirit of the Reformation, of the deepest interest; the *slaughter and death of the Witnesses*. Being a point, both in itself and in respect of events connected with it, of such extraordinary interest and importance, it is described in the Angel's narrative with corresponding distinctness and circumstantiality. Nor, I think, does it need more than to attend carefully to all the particulars predicted, in order to arrive, with a thorough conviction of its truth, at the right historical interpretation.

1. The first thing notable in the prophecy is the strength of the figure used respecting these representative witnesses, as being *both* of them *killed* by the Papal Beast, and *lying dead*. I speak of it as a *figure* because, the *witnesses* being *symbolic*, the *death* spoken of must be considered *symbolic* also: but it is a figure so strong as to signify nothing less than the *complete silencing* of those they represented;—their apparent extermination, in fact, before Christendom.—Now when was there any such complete silencing of all witnessing for Christ, and against the apostacy? I deem it essential, in order to a satisfactory solution of the question, that the period fixed on should be that at which,—not by the *prophetic commentator's* partial representation, but by *common consent of historians*, the voice of anti-papal testimony was most effectually silenced throughout Europe, and the Papacy (though with some quick following reaction, as the Apocalyptic sequel signified) most triumphant. And I may boldly say that there is but one period in European history that can answer this condition;—I mean *the opening of the xvth century*, just before the Reformation.—Let us pause a few moments on the epoch. In a former sketch of the close of the xvth century,¹ it was mentioned that in the year 1489 the Bohemian witness-churches sent deputies, to search throughout Europe for other

¹ See p. 37 *suprà*.

churches of kindred anti-papal feeling and profession ; but that such had been the silencing effect of the crusades, carried on just a little before against the Waldenses of France and Piedmont, that the deputies returned unsuccessful.¹ The Brethren had only, it is related, to implore God's mercy on fallen Christendom ; and, in hope of some gracious interference in its favour, to pass the resolution that same year in a synod, that *if* anywhere God should raise up faithful teachers and reformers of the church, they would make common cause with them.—Soon after this the Bohemian Brethren were themselves all but silenced ; in part through a persecuting decree of the Diet, and king Wladislas :²—their last noted martyr being, says Fleming, the famous *Andreas Paliwka*, slain A. D. 1511.³—And thus what was the aspect of things when the new century opened ? Let Milner's be my first historic testimony. “The xvith century opened,” he says, “with a prospect of all others the most gloomy, in the eyes of every true Christian. Corruption both in doctrine and in practice had exceeded all bounds : and the general face of Europe, though Christ's name was every where professed, presented nothing that was properly evangelical. The Roman Pontiffs were the uncontrolled patrons of impiety. The *Waldenses* were too feeble to molest the Popedom : and the *Hussites*, divided among themselves, and worn out by a long series of contentions, were at length *reduced to silence*.”⁴ To the same purport is the testimony of *Mosheim*. “At the commencement of this century, no danger seemed to threaten the Roman Pontiffs. The agitations previously excited by the *Waldenses*, *Albigenses*, *Beghards*, and more recently by the *Bohemians*, had been *suppressed* by counsel and the sword ; and the wretched *surviving* remnant of Bohemian heretics were an object rather of

¹ Bost's *Histoire des Freres*, i. 106 : “Ces deux deputés ne trouverent sauf un petit nombre de Vaudois opprimés, ou quelques fidèles isolés qui soupiraient en silence après la delivrance d'Israel.”

I find the same in Fleming, from Comenius ; but with the date of 1497, not 1489. He says that they heard, in the course of their mission, of Savonarola.

² *Ibid.*

³ Fleming quoted by Cuninghame, p. 14.

⁴ Cent. xvi. c. 7.

contempt than fear.”¹ So again Mr. Cuninghame ; (whose historic sketch of the epoch I may the rather quote because his prophetic explanation is independent of it :) “ At the commencement of the xvith century, Europe reposed in the deep sleep of spiritual death, under the iron yoke of the Papacy. That haughty power, like the Assyrian of the prophet, said in the plenitude of his insolence ; “ My hand hath found as a nest the riches of the people ; and as one gathereth eggs I have gathered all the earth : and there was none that moved the wing, or *opened the mouth*, or peeped.’ ”² Once more, in language strikingly to the point, the writer of the Article on the *Reformation* in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* thus describes the æra ; “ Every thing was quiet ; *every heretic exterminated* ; and the whole Christian world supinely acquiesced in the enormous absurdities inculcated by the Romish Church ; when ”—I only break off the quotation at his notice of just such a speedy, sudden, and extraordinary *revival of the witnessing*, as we saw from the prophetic sequel ought to follow the event intended by the *death of the Witnesses* ; and of which more hereafter.

Thus in regard of this *first* predicted characteristic of the suppression of witnessing for Christ, namely its *completeness throughout Western Christendom*, as indicated by the strong figure of the two witnesses being, not *one*, but *both* of them, *killed* by the Beast from the abyss, and *lying dead*, fixes the epoch approximately, on the clear testimony of history, to some little after the commencement of the xvith century. A reference, such as has been suggested by certain commentators, to one or another partial suppression of Protestant preaching, in one or another country of Western Christendom, *subsequent to the Reformation*, is, I conceive, by this one point of inconsistency (even were it the only one) put at once and altogether out of the question.³

¹ Cent. xvi. i. 1, slightly abridged.

² p. 99.

³ For example, 1st *Brightman's and Cuninghame's* ; which refers the *slaughter* of the witnesses to the *Interim Decree* May 1548, consequent on Charles Vth's victory over the Protestants at Muhlburg in 1547 ; their *resurrection* to Prince Maurice's victory, and the consequent *Treaty of Passau*, A. D. 1552, near four

2. The same epoch will appear to be pointed out, only more exactly and definitely, by the predicted *circumstantials* of the two witnesses' death, or rather of its public evidence and recognition:—circumstantials as to *place* and *occasion*.

The *local scene* of their being exposed as dead is described as the *πλατεια*, that is, “the *broad street* or *place* of the *Great City* :” the same *Great City*, it is added, “that is spiritually called *Sodom* and *Egypt* ; and where also their Lord¹ (the Lord of the two witnesses) was *crucified*.”

What the *Great City* itself, is a point settled : for it is declared by an Angel in chapter xvii of this Book to be the city which then reigned over the kings of the earth ;² in other words, that of *Rome* :—not indeed the

years after ; whereby civil and political equality was awarded to Protestants throughout the German empire.—2. *Bishop Lloyd's* and *Mr. Whiston's*, which dates the witnesses' death from the Duke of Savoy's slaughter and banishment of the Waldenses from Piedmont, December 1686 ; their resurrection from their triumphant return under Henri Arnaud, June 4, 1690 :—just similar to which is *Mr. Faber's* ; except that he dates the death from the Duke of Savoy's Edict forbidding the exercise of their religion, Jan. 31, 1686, the resurrection Aug. 16, 1689, when the exiles invaded Savoy.—3. That of Messrs. *Irving* and *Frere* ; which supposes the slaughter of the witnesses to have occurred A. D. 1790, on the French national espousal of Atheism ; their resurrection on the national re-profession of Christianity.

What meanwhile of the *English* witness-church at each of these epochs ?—For instance, with regard to the *first* mentioned, Mr. Cuninghame's observation on another occasion, (Appendix, 357,) “It will not be disputed that in the reign of the English *Elizabeth*, the Witnesses were in the political heaven of England,” applies nearly as much to the reign of *Edward VI* ; in which, as he says justly elsewhere (p. 110), “the English Reformation was completed.” How then could that be the period of the death of the two witnesses, which, as being comprehended in *Edward's* reign, was that of their *political ascent and exaltation* in England ? Not to add, how could they be slain in Germany itself by an Ordinance of doctrine and worship professedly *ad interim* only, purposely *ambiguous*, and as offensive (see Mosh. xvi. 1. 4. 4.) to the *Papists* as to the Protestants ?—Again, with regard to *Mr. Faber's* view, it was during the time of the Witnesses' supposed death that King William III was established, distinctly in virtue of his Protestantism, on the English throne.

Mr. Faber's view labours with other difficulties, from his making the two distinct Waldensian and Albigensian Churches his two Witnesses. For where is his evidence that the Waldensic Church, for example, was established as a separate Church from Rome before the time (above two centuries after his date) of *Claude of Turin* ? Besides that its witnessing was no *μαρτυρια*, in his sense of the word, i. e. as witnessing unto death, (see my Note 3, p. 360 *suprà*), till long after *Claude*.

¹ ὁ Κύριος αὐτῶν is Griesbach's reading. I have observed on this p. 356 Note 4.

² Apoc. xvii. 18.—Rome was called by the Greeks ἡ Μεγαλοπολις. So Eusebius, Orat. Const. ch. 22, συνοιδε και επαινει ἡ Μεγαλοπολις. On which Valesius observes that the title was very frequently so given.

mere *metropolitan Roman City* on the banks of the Tiber ; but, agreeably with the representative force of all the associated symbols,¹ the *political* or *ecclesiastical state* made up of the citizens of its empire ;² that is, at the time of the present vision, of those of the ten kingdoms of Papal Christendom.—It is called the *Great City*, in contrast to the *Holy City* just before mentioned by the Angel interpreter :—that society of believers, “ the called, and chosen, and faithful,” united together in an heavenly though invisible polity,³ whom the Gentile citizens of this Great City were through the appointed 1260 years to tread under foot.—It is designated also as *spiritually*, that is, *figuratively* or *antitypically*,⁴ *Egypt* and *Sodom*.⁵ The appropriateness of which figurative appellatives to the *Papal* state and city was so obvious, that they were applied to it from time to time during the prolonged period to which our attention has just been directed of its war against the witnesses :—e. g. that of *Egypt* by *Groste* and *Wicliff*, among others, by the early *Zuinglians* and by *Luther* ;⁶ as being the scene of

¹ It is desirable that the student should here note the *proportion* and *keeping* that there is between the Apocalyptic representative symbols : the Great City for all Papal Christendom, the Holy City for all the society of believers in it,—the temple and its two courts for the whole visible professing church, true and false,—the two witnesses for all Christ’s witnesses,—the period of 1260 days for 1260 years, &c.

² So *Bossuet* ; “ Rome and the Roman Empire.”—In fact the *Roman City* or *Civitas*, (taken in its *political* sense) in John’s time embraced all Italy, besides its other more distant citizens, whether enfranchised by birth or purchase ; and, a century afterwards, by virtue of Caracalla’s edict, all the constituency of the Empire. See my notice of this Edict, Vol. i. p. 156.

³ Compare what is said of the 144,000 as citizens of Mount Zion, the Holy City, in Apoc. xiv. 1 ; also my notice of the two contrasted cities in the general Introduction, Vol. i. pp. 101, 102.

⁴ Πνευματικῶς. Compare St. Paul’s application (1 Cor. x. 3, 4) of the adjective πνευματικόν to the *manna*, *water*, and *rock*, noted in Israel’s passage through the wilderness ; as being *typical* of Christ in his characters of the living bread, the living water, and shadowing rock to Christians in this world.

⁵ Let me here premise an explanation of the whole clause, as given not by a *Protestant* Commentator, but a *Jansenist*,—the learned and pious *Quesnel*. “ Partout ou regnent l’impurité, les abominations, les passions brutales, là est *Sodom*. Partout ou l’on persecute les gens de bien, là est *Egypte*. Partout ou souffrent les membres de Jésus Christ, là est le *Culvaire* ; là Jésus Christ est sur la croix ; là se remplit la mesure de ses souffrances, là se consomme son sacrifice dans ses membres choisis.”

⁶ “ *Groste* perceived that the whole scheme of the Papal Government was enmity with God ; and exclaimed that nothing but the sword (qu. the sword of the Spirit ?) could deliver the church from this *Egyptian* bondage.” *Wicliff*

priestly sorceries, religious darkness, and captivity of God's people: that of *Sodom* by the Romanists *Peter Damian*, *Pope Leo IX*, and *Baronius*, as well as by one and another of Christ's protesting witnesses, as being the seat of all moral impurity and abomination.¹—As to its further description as the *place*, or *state*, “where also the Witnesses' Lord had been crucified,” this additional designation, instead of constituting a difficulty in the way of our explanation, as some would have it,² is only a confirmation. For does it not seem the most probable hypothesis, even *primá facie*, that the word *πνευματικῶς*, “*figuratively*,” was meant to apply to this fresh suggested designative of the *Christ-rejecting Jerusalem*, as well as to the other two preceding? And does not the

compared the Romish priestcraft to “the accursed *sorceries* with which the sages of *Pharaoh* presumed to emulate the works of *Jehovah*.” *Le Bas' Wicliff*, pp. 68, 147.—So again *Luther*, in a Letter to *Melancthon* at the time of his first conference with the Cardinal *De Vio* at *Augsburgh*; “*Italy* is plunged, as in ancient times *Egypt*, in darkness that may be felt,” &c. And in *Switzerland*, on *Zwingle's* first preaching, they who longed for gospel-light said of him, “He will be our *Moses*, to deliver us out of the darkness of *Egypt*.” *Merle*, i. 382, ii. 338.

¹ *Peter Damian* (a monk of *Mount Avellan* in *Umbria* of the sixth century) wrote a Book on the four sorts of carnal sins under which the *Church* (the *Papal Church*) then suffered; which he dedicated to the then *Pope*, *Leo IX*, with the awful title *Gomorrhæus*. *Pope Leo's* answer (given in *Harduin* vi. 975) admits the truth of the representation. And *Cardinal Baronius*, with particular reference to the same period, makes a confession that might well, even on his own representations, have been extended much further; “that all flesh had so corrupted its way, that a deluge would not have washed it clean; and that men's horrible sins called for the *fire of Gomorrhæa*.” *Guers*, p. 180. This was just a little before the opening of the *Papal anti-witness war*.

Four centuries later the regular License for such crimes granted by *Sixtus IV*, or *Alexander VI*, (it is noted, I think, by both *Wesselus* of *Groningen* and *Luther*,) tells the awful tale. And accordingly *Luther* speaks “de execrandâ Venere Romanorum;” and in his Letter to *Pope Leo*, A. D. 1520, says, “You know that *Rome* is worse than *Sodom* and *Gomorrhæa*.”—Nor was the charge applicable to the priesthood of *Rome* itself alone, but of *Papal Christendom* generally. So *Myconius* of the town of *Saxe Gotha*, with which he was personally acquainted, just before the Reformation: ap. *Seckendorf*, i. 4. So again *Bishop Burnet*, in his account of the inquiry into the state of the English monasteries under *King Henry VIII*. “The full report of this visitation,” he says, “is lost. Yet have I seen an extract of a part of it concerning 144 houses, that contains in it abominations equal to any that were in *Sodom*.” *Hist. Reform.* Book iii. ad Ann. 1535.

² There is a whole sect, I believe, in the West of England, based very much on the presumption of this being the literal *Jerusalem*; and which in its religious theories exhibits one of the many curious and melancholy exemplifications of the weakness of the human mind.—As to their explanation of the clause before us, it is adopted alike by the *futurist* prophetic school generally, and by the *American Professor M. Stuart* of the wholly *praterist* school.

fact of those two other appellatives, *the Great City*¹ and *Egypt*, being coupled with it, almost *fix* on this, as on the rest, a figurative construction; seeing that the real literal Jerusalem was never so called? The force of these considerations was so much felt by various old expositors, who had no prophetic hypothesis to serve, as at once to decide them against explaining the clause of the literal and ancient Jerusalem:²—albeit they had not before them that most elucidatory fact which in our Commentary has appeared prominent: viz. *that the inhabitants of the Roman earth* were Apocalyptically figured after their profest conversion to Christianity as *the twelve tribes of Israel*,³ tribes very soon apostatizing; whence it followed that *the great city*, the capital of this Roman earth, would needs in consistency answer to the figure of apostate Israel's capital, i. e. to *the apostate Jerusalem*, as well as to old Rome or Babylon.⁴ It was indeed in this character specially that in process of time, as the apostacy rose to its height, the Great City, professing to be the Holy City also, became the scene

¹ The *Great City* "which reigneth over the kings of the earth." Apoc. xvii. 18.

Papal Rome, let it be remembered, itself assumed and affected the title of Jerusalem in a good sense. See p. 79 *suprà*.

² I cite three illustrations in evidence.

1. From the *Epist. of Paula and Eustochion to Marcella*, (ap. Hieron. Op. iv. ii. 549, Bened. Ed.) a view which we must suppose to have expressed Jerom's own opinion also.—How, they argue, could Jerusalem be the *Great City*, where Christ was crucified, seeing that it is elsewhere (Apoc. xi. 1) called the *Holy City*?* And they add; "*Spiritualiter* intelligenda aut singula: et *civitas magna* (quam videlicet ædificavit Cain) *hic mundus* intelligendus est, quæ spiritualiter appellatur Sodoma et Ægyptus. . . Ægyptum autem nunquam pro Jerusalem legimus, sed semper pro hoc mundo."

2. From *Berengaud*, a Commentator on the Apocalypse of the 9th century, ap. Ambros. Op. Bened. Ed. "Si per civitatem magnam Hierusalem terrestrem voluerimus intelligere, propter hoc quod dicit, '*Ubi et Dominus eorum crucifixus est*,' à veritate aberrabimus; eo quod illa Hierusalem usque ad solum destructa sit, et ista quæ pro eâ ædificata est non in eo loco, sed in alio, sita esse dicitur; neque Sodoma et Ægyptus dicenda est, eo quod à Christianis incolatur. Simulque considerandum quia ubicumque in hoc libro *civitas magna* ponitur, Babylonem, quæ est civitas Diaboli, et ex omnibus reprobis constat, significat." Ad loc.

3. From *Tichonius*; who simply explains it, "In plateis civitatis magnæ, id est in medio ecclesiæ."

³ See my Vol. I. p. 233, on the Sealing Vision.

⁴ 1 Peter v. 13. All the Romanists, and most Protestants understand by this Babylon ancient Rome.

* So too Neh. xi. 1, Isa. lii. 1, Dan. ix. 24, Matt. iv. 5, xxvii. 53.

of Christ's being crucified figuratively and afresh ;¹ just as the ancient Jewish state acted more prominently than the Roman in his first and literal crucifixion. In fact its thus crucifying Him afresh was, without any reference to the prophecy before us, seen like the rest at the time referred to in the vision, and asserted. It was this view which, more than any other, fixed itself on the mind of *Luther*, when with deep anxiety pondering on those Pontifical decrees and acts which embodied in them the Papal system, and impressed him with a sense of its absolutely *antichristian* character. "I have been reading *the Papal Decrees*," he wrote to Spalatin in the year 1519, just before the dispute at Leipsic, "and would whisper into your ears that I know not *whether the Pope be not ANTI-CHRIST*: to such an extent is *Christ* dishonoured in them, and crucified."²—In how many ways Christ had been crucified, as it were, in the Papal state and system, it would take long to describe.³ The point of those not unmeaning words, "where too *their Lord* hath been crucified," consists, I suspect, in the intimation thereby conveyed to his witnesses of his sympathy with *their* sufferings ; even as if specially crucified afresh *in them*, his members.⁴

¹ Compare Heb. vi. 6.

² " . . . tellement Christ est dénaturé et crucifié." Merle d'Aub. ii. 13.—Compare p. 57 *suprà*.

³ I may observe that there was almost a *literal* fulfilment of the figurative expression, after the establishment of the impious doctrine of *transubstantiation*, in the Romish Church. For thereby the priests professed each day to *offer up Christ* (the very Christ*) as the *hostia* or *victim* ; the cross being stamped on each consecrated wafer that was supposed to constitute him ; so as to mark the sacrifice as that of *crucifixion*. And in what spirit this was done, especially at the time of the *witnesses' death*, may be seen by reference to Luther's account of what he saw and heard on occasion of his visit to Rome. See *suprà* p. 35, Note 3 : and also Martene de Rit. i. 117, with the Plate.

⁴ So Thomas Aquinas on Antichrist, i. 54 ; referring very appositely to the legend of St. Peter's crucifixion, and its prefiguration to him by Christ's appearance bearing his cross Rome-wards, as if himself to be crucified there. For to the question, "Domine quo vadis?" the answer was, "Vado Romam iterum crucifigi." "Quia," says T. Aquinas, "quod fit servis suis, sibi reputat Christus fieri."

* So in the oath of abjuration required from Berenger, he had to swear to a belief that the bread and wine after consecration "substantialiter converti in veram et propriam carnem et sanguinem Jesu Christi, et esse verum Christi corpus quod natum est de Virgine, et quod pro salute mundi oblatum in cruce pendit, et quod sedet ad dexteram Patris." Hard. vi, 1585.—The language was nearly that of *Paschasius Radbertus*, the great advocate of transubstantiation in the ixth century ; "illam carnem quæ nata est de Virgine, passa in cruce, resurrexit de sepulchro." Mosh. ix. 2. 3. 19.

At any rate they imply (and the reminiscence seems to me very touching) that the servant in all this had only not been greater than his Lord ;¹ and that the insults and injuries inflicted on his witnesses in the Great Papal City, had been but the accompaniment of those inflicted on Himself.—It is almost needless to add that the resemblances of the Great City to *Egypt*, and *Sodom*, and *apostate Jerusalem*, gave intimation, as of the *crime*, so of the *punishment* impending ;—of the curse as on Jerusalem, the plagues as on Egypt, the burning as that of Sodom and Gomorrha.

Now then it was the *πλατεια*, the *broad street* or *place* of this Great City, that was to be the scene, according to the Covenant-Angel's description, of the corpses of his two witnesses being at the epoch intended exposed as dead. The figure of the *πλατεια* is borrowed from the chief *square* or *open place* of a city, (in Jewish towns usually near the *city gate*,) into which were the gatherings of the people ;² whether for political discussion, for objects of merchandize, or the administration of justice. From whence it seems to follow that there must be here signified some *city* or *town* in Western Europe, (not *kingdom*, as some have supposed,³ for that would be altogether out of scale and proportion in the picture,⁴) to which, above all others, there were wont to be the gatherings of the people of Christendom ; in short, as Vitringa ex-

¹ Compare Matt. x. 24, 25 ; “The servant is not greater than his Lord : if they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more those of his household.”—It will be well for the reader to mark in this and other passages in the Gospels, (e. g. Matt. xxiv. 45, xxv. 34, Luke xii. 45, 46, &c) Christ's mode of speaking of Himself sometimes in the *third person* : in order to the conviction that the expression, “their Lord,” constitutes no objection against the view of Christ's still continuing the speaker in this part, as well as in the commencement, of the narrative of the two witnesses.

² Thus in 2 Chron. xxxii. 6, the *Street of the Gate*, or rather *Place of the Gate*, (Sept. *πλατεια*) is mentioned as the place of the *gathering of the people*. Again in 2 Sam. xv. 2, the *way of the gate*, or, as elsewhere more briefly, *the gate*, (so Deut. xxi. 19, &c.) is noted as the *place of judgment*. In Greek towns the more usual term for this was *αγορα*. Eusebius unites the two together ; Vit. Const. iii. 39 ; *επ' αυτης πλατειας αγορας*.

Grotius compares Ezek. xxviii. 23, “ubi similiter *platea* nominantur.”

³ Jurieu referring it to *France*, Cuninghame to *Germany*, Habershon to *England*, &c.

⁴ On the observation of *scale* and *proportion* in the Apocalyptic figures, see Note I, p. 376, *suprà*.

presses it, that which might fitly be regarded as the *forum* of the antichristian empire. And what that city or town, can any one doubt that is at all acquainted with European history? Let Gibbon answer the question. "The nations," he says, in his sketch of the rise of the Roman Papacy, "began once more to seek on *the banks of the Tiber* the kings, the laws, and the oracles of their fate."¹ It was to *Rome*, as the *supposed* Holy City, that were directed, through the middle ages, the confluent pilgrimages from Western Christendom; ² to *Rome* the gatherings as the fountain of ecclesiastical law and government; to *Rome* the assembling, as the most frequent scene of the Western General Councils.³—In effect, as I must now add,

The very *occasion* of the two witnesses appearing as dead corpses seems described to have been one of precisely such a gathering as that last mentioned; the gathering of some *General Council* from the several states of Western Christendom. For, in a clause strangely overlooked by too many commentators, there is mention of *deputies*, assembled in the *πλατεια* of the Great City, "from the people, and kindred, and tongues, and nations,"⁴ that made these dead bodies the subject of their contemplation and rejoicings.

¹ ix. 151; and again xii. 262. So too Hallam, iii. 336.

² See p. 17, *suprà*. The pilgrimages were directed to Rome as the great mart of the "*merchandize of the souls of men*," mentioned Apoc. xviii. 11, 12, in its list of the wares of the Great City.

³ The four first General Councils of the West were held in the *Lateran* at Rome, A. D. 1123, 1139, 1179, and 1215, respectively. After this followed the General Councils held at *Lyons* (twice) *Vienne*, *Constance*, and *Basle*, in the years 1245, 1274, 1311, 1414, 1431: then again the 5th *Lateran*, in 1512, at Rome.

The figure naturally suggests itself to commentators when speaking of Rome, though not in reference to the passage before us. So *Vitringa*, p. 1086, calls it the "*forum et emporium spirituale*" of Roman Christendom. *Daubuz*, p. 805, calls it "*the great mart*," the Roman clergy being its merchants and factors. Bicheno, *Signs of the Times*, p. 48, says, "Rome is the *centre and court* of the antichristian city; and the ten kingdoms, or states, the streets of the city."—I observe in Harduin vii. 1111, a larger, but not unillustrative use of the figure. Excommunicated persons by the Romish Church are excluded "*à foro ecclesiastico et civili*," from every right, civil and commercial, of the great forum of Rome.

⁴ *εκ των λαων και εθνων*.—It is, I think, worth observing that Eusebius continually uses *εθνη* of the Provincials of the Roman Empire. So, e. g. *Vit. Const.* i. 25, and *Notes* p. 183.

So that, on the whole, in turning from prophecy to history, from the symbolic picture to the thing symbolized, it seems almost impossible to mistake the *precise scene* and *occasion* alluded to. It can surely be none other than that of the very *Lateran Council*, held from 1512 to 1517, under the Pontificates of Julius II and Leo X, just before the Reformation; of which I was earlier led to give a somewhat full description, as constituting an epoch, ever memorable in history, of the *triumph of the Papal Antichrist*.¹—The circumstance of its having been then so notably the scene of Antichrist's triumph only tends to confirm our presumption: as also the fact, just a little while since illustrated, that at the precise period of this Council's sitting, still, as in times earlier, the figurative designatives here specified of *Egypt*, and *Sodom*,² and the *place where the Lord had been crucified*, were expressly applied to the Roman church and city.—Indeed the parallel between the characteristics here predictively ascribed to Rome and the Papacy, and those that were then and there actually applied to it, is yet more complete and remarkable. For, besides the resemblances above-mentioned,—as the Papal Beast is here styled the *Beast from the abyss*, so at the time of the Lateran Council the proverb prevailed that, if there was a hell, *Rome was built upon it*, being an *abyss* whence all sins originated: ³—as Rome (inclusive of its empire)

¹ See my ch. iii. p. 74, &c. *suprà*.

² The *Sodomitic* character of the Great City was also confessed by one of the Orators of the Lateran Council; who, in his advocacy of a reformation of manners speaks of the "sacras ædes" as "lenonibus et catamitis commissas." (I have mislaid the reference.)—Is this to be wondered at after Pope Alexander's regular License, given in 1498, for such crimes?

The versified anagram on *Roma* and *amor*, the name read backwards, given by Brightman, *ad loc.* tells the tale of a later period; and he further refers to Jerom Zegeed Mutius, an avowed and shameless advocate of the sins of Sodom, as declaring that Julius III (Pope about 1550, during the sittings of the Council of Trent) did by his Letters Patent expressly allow his Books advocating them.

³ So Luther states, on occasion of his visit to Rome in the year 1510; that is about a year or so before the gathering of the Lateran Council. Again in his Letter to Pope Leo he thus speaks of Rome and the Papal court; "Olim janua cæli, nunc patens quoddam os inferni; et tale os quod, urgente irâ Dei, obstrui non potest." Merle d'Aub. i. 185, ii. 126.—"At this time (about A. D. 1500, under Pope Alexander VI) the complaint arose that the Pope prepared the way

was called the *Great City*, or *Babylon*, and hinted at as the *apostate Jerusalem* of apostate Israel, so the appellation of *Babylon* was declared by one of the Council's orators to have been affixed to Rome by St. Peter himself; ¹ and the title of *Jerusalem*, as head of the twelve tribes of the Christian Israel, vindicated to it: ²—as the meeting-place of the deputies from the tongues, and kindred, and people, was styled in the Apocalyptic description the *πλατεια*, or *broad-place*, of the Great City, so by another orator of the Lateran Council it was remarked, that their meeting-place in the Lateran Church of Rome was the *central area*, or *broad-place*, of the *Western world*.³ All this, of course, yet more strengthens the presumption of this Council being the occasion and scene intended in the prediction before us. Nor, I am sure, will any thing more be needed than an attentive consideration of its acts and proceedings, to discern the fulfilment, even to the minutest accuracy, of all that is further described in the Apocalyptic prefigurative picture of the *death* of Christ's two witnesses; including the subsequent *insults* to their dead corpses, and *rejoicings* over them.

Let us advance then to a brief examination of the Council's proceedings, with reference to this particular subject.—And is not the very first thing that meets our view in them strikingly to the point? I mean the setting forth, as one of the three express objects of the

for Antichrist; and that he laboured for the coming of the kingdom, not of heaven, but of *Satan*." Ranke, Hist. of Popes, i. 52.

¹ Viz. in Puccio's oration in the 9th Session: "Urbem ipsam quam *Babylonem* Apostolorum Princeps, divino afflatus Spiritu, nuncupavit." Harduin, ix. 1765.

² See the extract from an oration in the Council given p. 79 *suprà*.—Let me add from Hard. x. 14 a somewhat later illustration. In the Council of Trent the Romish Bishops are address as *governing the twelve tribes of Israel*, or whole Christian people: "Sedemus tanquam *duodecim tribus Israel*, quibus comprehenditur universus populus Dei." It is a direct Trentine recognition of the propriety of my explanation of that most important Apocalyptic figure, Vol. i. p. 229.

³ So Baltassar del Rio, in the Dedication of his Sermon of the 7th session to king Ferdinand of Spain: "Nec pudit in *mediâ urbis et orbis terrarum ac universalis ecclesiæ sacrosanctâ arêâ* propalam bonos extulisse," &c. Ib. 1701.

In Martene ii. 89 the *Platea Lateranensis*, or Square before the Lateran Church, is noted. Now on the Pope's solemn cursing of heretics each Maunday Thursday, from the Portico of the Lateran Church, it is into this Piazza that the torches or lights of the heretics are thrown down, and quenched. See this noted p. 387.

Council, in its Papal Bull of convocation, the *total extirpation* not of *schisms* only (those of the Princes and Cardinals at Pisa,) but of *heresies*?¹ For, transferring *Papal* language to *Scriptural*, this last enunciated purpose meant nothing else than the annihilation, or subjection, of all that might yet remain in Western Christendom of witnesses for Christ.—It is implied, we see, that opposing heretics were looked on as not yet *altogether* silenced, the witnesses as not yet *altogether* exterminated or extinct. And this indeed is in another part of the Bull expressly stated: for it speaks of *ancient heresies* in different parts of Christendom still surviving.² Further, in the 6th Session, held April 27, A. D. 1513, information is given us as to *the particular heretics* specially intended.³ It was not the *English Lollards*, nor the *Waldenses of Piedmont*. These, it would appear, both from their omission in the notice of the sessional orator, and from other more direct testimony,⁴ had been reduced to silence. It was the remnant of the *Bohemian Hussites*; now purified from the errors that had crept into their body, and formed, as already elsewhere intimated,⁵ into the association of the *United Brethren*. These had from the year 1504 begun afresh to attract notice:⁶ and, whether with the Bohemian king⁷ favoring them, or hostile, of these the extermination, or

¹ “Ad ecclesiæ exaltationem, unitatem, et Reformationem; schismatum vero et hæresum totalem extirpationem.” Harduin ix. 1591.

² Ut antiquæ hæreses quæ in diversis Christianorum partibus nondum extinctæ sunt, et pessimum noviter pullulans schisma, extinguantur. Hard. ix. 1590.

³ “Accedente ad hoc Bohemorum regis perfidi, et in apertam jam hæresim prolabantis, sceleratæque et urhi vicinâ opinione.” Ib. 1685.

⁴ See Note 1, p. 386 infra.

⁵ See p. 27, supra.—On the true *witness*-character of these Bohemians see Bp. Newton, p. 589, from Æneas Sylvius; also Mosheim, xv. 2. 3. 7, and Waddington p. 603.

⁶ Waddington, ch. xxv. p. 603.—In the year 1506 an *Apology* was addressed by the Bohemian or Waldensian Brethren to Wladislas King of Hungary and Bohemia; which is referred to by Gretzer, B. P. M. xxv. 259, Maitland, Facts and Doc. 126, and Faber, 577. There is also a Letter of the Bohemians to Erasmus of the date 1513, which is noted by Ranke, i. 76.

⁷ I infer his sanction of the heretics near him from that passage of the orator of the Session which was quoted just above in my Note 2. But it may have been a case of suspicion only. Four years before he had joined, as we have seen, with the Papal party in issuing an edict against them. See p. 373.

subjugation, was considered as one of the express objects of the Council.—And what then the measures taken in reference to it? Through the seven earliest Sessions there appears nothing bearing thereon. The *primary* object thus far, both with Pope Julius and Pope Leo, was to extinguish the *Conciliabulum*, or rival private Council under the French king's patronage at Pisa; and so constitute the Lateran synod an undoubted *Council General*, qualified to decree and act in the affairs of Christendom. But so soon as (after Leo's accession) this was effected, so soon as the French king had given in his adhesion,¹ and the schismatic Pisan Cardinals broken up and submitted themselves,—then, these preliminaries having been accomplished, no time was lost in proceeding to the *Bohemian* affair, among others. In a Papal Bull inserted, with approbation of the Council, in the very next or 8th Session, held December 1513, a charge was issued, summoning the dissidents in question without fail to appear and plead before the Council at its next Session; unless indeed they should have previously done so before a neighbouring Papal Legate: ²—the object declared being their conviction and reduction within the bosom of the Catholic church; and the time finally fixed for the said important Session May the 5th, in the spring ensuing.

Thus was the crisis come which was to try the faith of this bleeding remnant of witnesses, and exhibit its

¹ Thus the Council was *de facto* a *General* one. And such indeed it was intended to be; as express in the general invitation of the Bull of Convocation to *all* the Princes of Christendom. So long as France remained separate its œcumenic character (according to the received laws in Western Europe) was doubtful. Thus in the Council of Trent, on Cardinal Lorraine's intimation of the recall of himself and compatriots by his master the French King, he observed that after their departure the Council could not be called *General*, as there would want a *Nation*.—Bossuet's objections to the œcumenic character of the 5th Lateran Council are quite futile.

² "Præterea cum ex diuturna et multiplici hæresi Bohemorum plurimum Deus offendatur, et Christianus populus scandalizetur, eosdem hortamur in Domino ut vel ad nos et hoc sacrum Lateranense Concilium, vel ad Thomam Cardinalem Legatum, aliquot ex suis Oratores cum sufficienti mandato destinare non negligant; ad tractandum de opportuno remedio quo errores quibus diu detinentur agnoscant, et ad ecclesiæ gremium, Deo duce, reducantur:—quibus veniendi, eundi, standi, discedendi, redeundi, in fide Pontificiâ saluum conductum concedimus." Hard. ix. 1722.

vitality or *death*. And would they then face their Lord's enemies? Would they brave the terrors of death, and plead his cause before the lordly Legate, or the anti-christian Council; like the Waldenses at Albi and at Pamiers, like Wicliff and Cobham in England, like Huss and Jerome at the Constance Council,¹ or Luther afterwards at Augsburg and at Worms?—Alas! no. The day of the 9th Session arrived. The Council met. But no report from the Cardinal Legate gave intimation either of the pleading, or even of any continued stirring, of the Bohemian heretics.² No officer of the Council announced the arrival of deputies from them, to plead before it. Nor again was there a whisper wafted to the Synod from any other state, or city, or town in Christendom, of a movement made, or a mouth opened, to promulgate or support the ancient heresies.³ Throughout the length and breadth of Christendom Christ's witnessing servants were silenced: they appeared as dead. The orator of the Session ascended the pulpit: and, amidst the applause of the assembled Council, uttered that memorable exclamation of triumph,—an exclamation which, notwithstanding the long multiplied anti-heretical decrees of Popes and Councils, notwithstanding the yet more multiplied anti-heretical crusades and inquisitorial fires, was never, I believe, pronounced before, and certainly never since,—“*Jam nemo reclamat, nullus obsistit!*”⁴ “There is an end of resistance to the Papal rule and religion: opposers there exist no more:” and again;

¹ I might add the Bohemian Hussites at Basle. For when the Council of Basle invited them to come and plead A. D. 1433, they sent their deputies.

² It is evident from the triumphant tenor of the oration then spoken before the assembly, that if a report was sent in from the Cardinal Legate, it was only one to announce the submission or silencing of the Bohemians:—for the orations were prepared by the appointed preachers, on information previously given them.

³ From Bishop Burnet's History, it appears that in England there were no witnesses against the Papal system from 1511 to 1519; the terror of the executions of 1511 producing recantation from such as were examined. Hist. Ref. B. i. ad fin. p. 39—42.—Of the *Waldenses of Piedmont* the last notice that has met my eye, before Luther and the Reformation, is the testimony of Claude de Scyssel, Archbishop of Turin, to their moral respectability, about the year 1500. (See Leger i. 184, and Faber, p. 421.)—Milner (Cent. xiii. c. 2 from Usher) refers to Letters from the *Waldenses* of the date of 1508, pleading poverty as the excuse for their pastors working in manual labour.—In 1501 it appears that there was the Inquisition at *Embrun in Dauphiny*.

⁴ Hard. ix. 1763.

“The whole body of Christendom is now seen to be subjected to its *Head*, i. e. to *Thee*.”¹—So did “they from the people, and kindred, and tongues, and nations,” assembled in Rome the *πλατεια* of Anti-christendom, (indeed in Rome’s own chief *πλατεια*, that of the Lateran, the same where each year had been enacted for centuries the Popes’ solemn cursing of such heretics even unto death,²) so, I say, did these delegates there look on Christ’s witnesses as thenceforth not excommunicate and accurst only, but dead.³ Let the reader well mark the description. For it is a description from the life. And let him well mark the day. For it seems scarce possible that we can be mistaken in regarding it as the *precise commencing date* of the predicted three and a half years, during which Christ’s witnesses were to appear as mere dead corpses in the face of Christendom. It was May 5, 1514.

There are yet two characteristic circumstances noted as accompaniments of this the Council’s recognition of their death;—the one affecting the *slaughtered witnesses*, the other *its own friends and members*.

The *first* is thus stated: “And they from the kindreds and tribes, &c, shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put into graves.”—The expression is of course *symbolic*; as having reference to the *two symbolic witnesses*, the apocalyptic representatives of *many*. We have already however seen so much of the precision of the apocalyptic figures, and their being drawn as it were *from the life*, that we may well expect that such too was the case here; and that in some edict of the Council, issued on the occasion, the indignity and outrage above-mentioned

¹ “Jam universum illius (ecclesiæ) corpus uni Capiti, hoc est Tibi, subditum esse conspicitur.” Ibid. ² See Note 1 p. 383.

³ There seemed too the fulfilment of a Picture which the Reader may remember, of a shepherd fishing, and casting the bad fish into a fire, with the motto, “Non desinam usque ad unum;” exhibited in Rome on the day of Leo Xth’s assumption, and noticed by me p. 54 *suprà*. The Pope, though the chief *pastor* of Christendom, still retained also the memorial of St. Peter’s having been a *fisherman*, and issued his edicts, “*sub annulo Piscatoris* :” so that the conjunction of the two characters in the picture was perfectly appropriate.

may have been actually affixed to such of Christ's witnessing body as might *individually* happen at the time to lie dead. And such indeed was the case. We find that an edict was issued from Pope and Council, that same day, just after the Preacher's oration of triumph; the declared object of which was the perpetual *elimination from the Church visible of all heretics*: and in the which there were adjudicated against them, throughout Christendom, all the "*debitæ pœnæ*," or punishments imposed on heretics by former Bulls and Councils.¹ Now among these punishments there was one most constantly decreed and constantly enforced, which affected the heretic when *dead*, as others affected him while *living*; I mean the *exclusion of his corpse from burial*, as a person excommunicate and without the pale of the Church:²—an indignity borrowed from those inflicted by the Roman Pagan

¹ The Decree is as follows: "Et ut omnes ficti Christiani, ac de fide malè sentientes, eujuscumque generis aut nationis fuerint, necnon hæretici, seu aliquâ hæresis labe polluti, à Christi fidelium cœtu penitus eliminentur, . . . ac *debitâ animadversione* puniantur, —statuimus ut contra eos diligenter inquisitione ubique procedatur, per iudices per nos deputandos; et ejus criminis reos et legitimè convictos, *debitis pœnis* puniri: relapsos vero absque ullâ spe veniæ aut remissionis affici volumus."—Hard. ix. col. 1757. Elsewhere too all former Decrees of the Roman Pontiffs, on both this and other points, were expressly renewed by the Council, and confirmed.

² I have already noticed some earlier exemplifications of this indignity to the dead, as inflicted on Gottshale by Hincmar, and again on the body of a heretic, friend to the 14 Canons of Orleans, exhumed and exposed at the time of those Canons' condemnation, A. D. 1022. See pp. 224, 248.—These, though the actions of private individuals, were yet according to the tenor of Pope Leo's excommunicatory sentence, "*Illis cælum claudimus, et terram ad sepeliendum negamus*:"* and of Gelasius' consentient decree; "*Si obstinato animo defuncti fuerint (excommunicati,) nos illorum causam, juxta beati Leonis sententiam, divino judicio reservantes, quibus visis non communicavimus mortuis non communicamus*." (Hard. vi. ii. 1818.) At length in the 12th century Christendom, as a public body, moved in the matter. Thus in the third Council of Lateran A. D. 1179 *Christian burial* was denied to heretics: the same in the Lateran Council A. D. 1215, and the Papal Decree of Gregory IX, A. D. 1227; the same again in that of Pope Martin, immediately after the Council of Constance, A. D. 1422: the which Council ordered that *Hicliß's* body should be exhumed, (the fulfilment of the order is described by Foxe iii. 96) and that the ashes of *Huss*, instead of burial, should be collected and cast into the Lake of Constance.—I may add that *Savonarola's* ashes were similarly cast into the Arno, A. D. 1498, and that in the first Bull entrusted to the Cardinal Caietan against *Luther*, this was one of the declared penalties, that both *Luther* and his partizans should be deprived "*ecclesiasticæ sepulturæ*." See Waddington p. 717, Merle D'Aub. i. 355; Foxe v. 667.

* So too in the other excommunications in Martene ii. 324: 1. "*Nec habeant alteram quàm asinorum sepulturam*;" 2. "*Non sepeliantur*." See p. 355.

persecutors on the early Christian martyrs ;¹ but of which the force and terrors were under the Papal regime tenfold greater in general estimation ; forasmuch as it was supposed to involve the eternal damnation of the wretch unburied.—I say in the edict of the Lateran Council, thus issued, there was a strict enforcement of this punishment ;—a strict enforcement of this mark of reprobation on the corpses of such as might then be lying dead, convict of heresy, in any part of Christendom. So that it was a fulfilment to *the very letter* of what was predicted ; “ They from the kindreds and tongues and people *shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put into graves.*”

The *other* act, noted as consequent on the Council’s recognition of the Witnesses’ death, is the *mutual congratulations* of its members, and complacent *interchange of presents* among them that dwelt on the Roman earth. “ And they that dwell on the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another : because these two prophets troubled² them that dwelt on the earth.”—And we have but to open again the page of history, in order to see how it was fulfilled. For example,³ it was just as things were drawing to the desired consummation, and when every thing seemed to announce the final suppression of *anti-papal heresy*, as well as of *anti-papal schism*, that those magnificent Eastern presents were offered to Pope Leo in his Master’s name by the Portuguese Envoy, of which I have given a somewhat detailed account elsewhere ;⁴ and which were responded to by the yet more extraordinary donation from

¹ So Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. ix. 8 ; Κατα μεσας αγορας νεκρα και γυμνα σωματα εφ’ ημεραις πλειοσιν αταφα διερριμενα θεαν τοις ορωσιν οικτροτατην παρεχεσθαι.

² εβασανισαν. I translate this word *troubled* from its use in 2 Peter ii. 8 ; where it is said of Lot that he *vexed* his righteous soul, ψυχην εβασανιζειν, at the sight and hearing of the evil that was passing in Sodom.

³ I might perhaps mention in this list of presents that of the *hat* and *sword* sent by Leo to king Henry of England. For it was sent but a few months before ; viz. on Mar. 1. 1513. See Roscoe’s Leo X. Appendix No. 105.—The Pope’s Letter that accompanied the gift was among the Records of the State Office negligently sold away a year or two since. The circumstance was mentioned by Lord Aberdeen, I think, in the House of Lords.

⁴ See p. 68 *suprà*. This was in March 1514.

the Pope to the king of Portugal, not of the *golden rose*¹ only, that object of envy among princes, but of the *sovereignty* (that is as a Papal Feudatory) of *half the Eastern world*.²—The *making merry* was also fulfilled. The splendor of the dinners and fetes³ given by the Cardinals on the triumphant close of the Council,—a splendor unequalled since the days of Pagan Rome's greatness,—is made the subject of special record by the Historian of Leo the Xth.⁴ He records it as a matter characteristic of the age and of the occasion. And it is precisely in this point of view that I would here wish to set the prediction before the reader; I mean as being not merely a true prediction of fact, but one (like the apocalyptic pictures generally) characteristic of the spirit and feeling of the times.—The more immediate subject of congratulation and joy was the healing of the French or Pisan *schism*: because the *heretics* had been reduced so low by former crusades and Inquisitions, as to be no longer the object of terror that they once were. Yet the remembrance of what had been, and of the vexation and trouble occasioned by them in times not very far distant,⁵ (even as by Elijah the troubler of Israel to king Ahab,⁶) had not past away. In fact the very first Sermon before the Council, in terms tantamount to the

¹ It was on March 26 that Pope Leo blessed the rose.—On the same day he celebrated a solemn procession and thanksgiving, for the extinction of the schism, the victories of the King of Hungary over the Turks, and the discoveries of the King of Portugal.

² See p. 72 *suprà*.—This donation followed on that of the golden rose at a little interval. It was just but a few weeks before the 9th sitting; and when the standing Committee must have been aware of the favourable issue of the Bohemian affair, as on the fifth of May set forth before the assembled Council.

³ Luke xv. 32; "It was meet that we should *make merry* and be glad." The expression is very generally connected with *feasting*.—In Esther ix. 19, 22, the interchange of *portions*, or gifts of that nature, is also mentioned in connexion with the Jewish feasts of joy. "Therefore the Jews made the 14th of the month of Adar a day of gladness and feasting, and a good day, and of *sending portions* one to another."

Pareus observes on this passage, that "when *heretics are burnt*, Papists play at frolicsome games, celebrate feasts and banquets, sing *Te Deum Laudamus*, and wish one another joy." And so too *Bullinger* ad loc. ⁴ Roscoe, p. 236.

⁵ So Thomas Aquinas, *De Antichristo*, i. 57; "Cruciverunt malos quorum damnationes prædixerunt, et ita cruciandos annunciarunt; vel cruciaverunt eos contradicendo iniquitati eorum."

"Art thou he that troublest Israel?" 1 Kings xviii. 17. Probably there is an allusion to this in the passage before us.

apocalyptic phrase, expressly records it.¹ Hence the mixing up of the victory over them among the ingredients of the joy of those that dwelt on the earth. Altogether, as Dean Waddington describes the scene on the Council's closing, the feeling of joy, triumph, and self-gratulation at Rome was the exact counterpart to that described in the Text :—" The pillars of the papal strength seemed visible and palpable ; and Rome surveyed them with exultation from her golden palaces." And again ; " The assembled princes and prelates separated from the Council with *complacency, confidence, and mutual congratulations* on the peace, unity, and purity of the Church." ²

And were their congratulations then, and their triumph, to be long continued? Very different was the predicted purpose of God respecting both them, and the cause they had been oppressing. The next thing that I am called in the prophecy to mark and to explain is,

IIIrdly, THE SPEEDY AND WONDERFUL RESURRECTION OF THE WITNESSES.—" And after the ³ three and a half days the breath of life from God entered into them ; and they stood upon their feet."

But what the need of any explanation of mine to suggest the events that here answered to the prophecy? History speaks for itself. Not in the compass of the whole ecclesiastical history of Christendom, save and except in the case of the death and resurrection of Christ Himself, is there any such example of the sudden, mighty, and triumphant resuscitation of his cause and Church from a state of deep depression, as was just after the separation of the Lateran Council exhibited, in the *protesting voice of Luther*, and burst of the glorious *Reformation*. The sudden contrast forces itself on every writer of history, whether of the Romish Church

¹ " *Officit nobis, et nos universalemque ecclesiam magnopere perturbat, hæresis infidelitasque.*" Hard. ix. 1604.—*Heresy* is defined at the same time as the exercise of *private judgment* : " *qui non ad propheticas voces, apostolicas literas, evangelicas auctoritates, sed ad semet ipsos recurrit.*" The Orator was Bernard Zane.

² Waddington, pp. 663, 720.

³ The definite article is in the original.

or Protestant. Take the Popish Annalist *Raynaldus*. “How ill, alas!” says he, “these most holy laws (against relapsing heretics) were observed, appears from the hydra-birth of the *Lutheran heresy* so soon after? ¹” Take the writer before quoted from the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. “Every thing was quiet; *every heretic exterminated*; and the whole Christian world supinely acquiescing in the enormous absurdities inculcated by the Romish Church, when—in 1517,—the empire of superstition received its first attack,” (its death-blow almost) “from Luther.” Take Mr. *Cunninghame*;—who draws not his vigorous sketch, let it be again observed, with a view to prove the coincidence in question, his own views of the prophecy being different, but simply as a matter of history: “At the commencement of the xvth century Europe reposed in the deep sleep of spiritual death, under the iron yoke of the papacy. There was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped:—when, suddenly, in one of the universities of Germany the voice of an obscure monk was heard, the sound of which rapidly filled Saxony, Germany, and Europe itself, shaking the very foundations of the Papal power, and arousing men from the lethargy of ages.”

But does the *chronology* suit? It was predicted that *for three and a half days* the Witnesses were to be looked on as dead: in other words that there was to be the interval of *three and a half years* between the *first recognition of their extinction* by the assembled deputies from the states of Christendom, and *their resuscitation*. Was this the interval between that memorable day of the ninth session of the Lateran Council on which the Orator pronounced his Pæan of triumph over the extinction of heretics and schismatics, and the first and yet more memorable act of protestation by Luther? Let us calculate. The day of the 9th Session was, as we have seen, May 5, 1514; the day of Luther’s posting up his Theses at Wittenberg (the well known epoch of the Reforma-

¹ Given by Waddington, p. 661.

tion) Oct. 31, 1517.¹ Now from May 5, 1514 to May 5, 1517 are three years : and from May 5, 1517 to October 31 of the same year 1517, the reckoning in days is as follows ;

May 5—31....	27	August.....	31
June	30	September...	30
July.....	31	October.....	31

in all 180 or half 360 days ; that is just half a year. So that the whole interval is *precisely, to a day*, three and a half years ; *precisely, to a day*, the period predicted in the Apocalyptic prophecy ! !—Oh wonderful prophecy, is the exclamation that again forces itself on my mind ! Oh the depth of the riches of the wisdom and the fore-knowledge of God !

So then “the *breath of life* from God entered into the slain Witnesses, and they *stood upon their feet*.”—The figure of a *revival, resuscitation, or resurrection*, is so natural as well as striking, and so evidently appropriate in the case of *Luther* and the *Witnesses preceding* him, that we cannot wonder at its having been perpetually applied in the case by writers of whatever different creed and sentiments. Not by way of illustration, but on account of its beauty and historic interest, I must beg permission to subjoin an exemplification of it made *anticipatively*, I may almost say *prophetically*, 100 years before *Luther*, by the martyr *Huss*. We are told ; “He dreamt,” (it was in his lonesome dungeon at Constance, just but a few nights before his martyrdom,) “and it seemed as if some pictures of CHRIST, that he had been painting on the walls of his oratory, were effaced by the Pope and the Bishops. The dream afflicted him. But the next night he dreamed again, and seemed to see painters more in number, and with more of effect, restoring the pictures of Jesus. He told the dream to his friends. ‘I am no

¹ See p. 99 *suprà*.—In Junckner there is an account of the celebration of the 1st Centenary of this October 31, in Germany, as the Centenary of the Reformation. In Pearson’s *Life of Swartz* his annual celebration of the day is also noted. And so in Protestant Germany in 1817.

vain dreamer ;' he said : ' but hold for certain that the image of Christ shall never be effaced. They wish to destroy it : but it shall be painted afresh in the hearts of gospel-preachers better than myself. And I, *awakening* as it were *from the dead*, and *rising from the grave*, shall rejoice with exceeding great joy,"¹—In turning from John Huss to Pope Adrian, Leo Xth's successor, we find a Commentator, such as he might little have expected, both on the martyr's dream and on the apocalyptic prophecy. In 1523 he wrote thus in a Brief addressed to the Diet at Nuremberg : "The *heretics Huss and Jerome* are now *alive again* in the person of *Martin Luther*."²


There remains but one clause more for notice in the prophetic description. After stating the Witnesses' revival and *standing upon their feet*, it adds ; "And *great fear fell on those that beheld them*."—Now it strikes me that there is a distinctiveness in the phraseology here deserving of remark. It is not said, "Great fear fell on *them*," ἐπ' αὐτοῦς, in the pronominal accusative, with reference to the members of Council just before spoken of as contemplating their dead corpses ; but ἐπὶ τοῦς θεωροῦντας, upon "*such as beheld them*." The Lateran Council in fact had separated, and the deputies returned home, a few months before Luther's Protest. So that the first impression from it was not the same on one and all. At Rome

¹ Merle d'Aub. I. vii. 79 ; from Huss. Epist. sub temp. Concilii scriptæ. It is noted also by Foxe, iii. 508, as in a letter to John de Clum.

There has been handed down a tradition that Huss named *one hundred years* as the period after which there should be this revival of Christian witnessing, and a judgment on the Papacy : just the interval between himself and Luther. For it was in 1415 that he was burnt at the stake, and in 1517 that Luther began his protest. A medal exists which represents the martyr at the stake, and has the legend round it, "Centum revolutis annis Deo respondebitis et mihi." A copy of this is given in Junckner, p. 24, also of another of nearly the same character, but a more ancient type, p. 48. Milner (the Dean of Carlisle) entirely distrusts these medals, as if struck after Luther and the Reformation. But with regard to the last mentioned the evidence of prior antiquity is certainly by no means contemptible. So the *Abbé Bizot*, cited by Junckner, p. 39 : "Des médailles modernes... la première frappé est celle de Jean Huss en 1415."—It is noticed also in Foxe iii. 508.

² Milner, p. 800.—So again Mariana, in his Preface to Lucas de Tuy ; "Lutheranas, Calvinianas, cæterasque pestes in Albigenibus impugnari ; in quibus *revixisse* videntur Albigenes majori impudentiâ." B. P. M. xxv. 189. Also Thuanus, apud Faber, p. 512.

THE ANCIENT
MEDAL OF HUSS' MARTYRDOM & PROPHECY.



From Buckner

Pope Leo, in his golden palace, incredulous as to the possibility of any thing occurring, especially from so mean an origin, to affect his supremacy and power, treated it as a mere passing ebullition of feeling and genius in the monk of Wittemberg.¹ But not so they that were on the spot, and *beheld*, when, like an electric shock, the voice of the revived gospel-witness thrilled through Germany. Not so, I say, Tetzl, Cardinal Caietan, Eck, Miltitz. Of these each one, as they entered on the scene, and looked on, trembled in consternation. For they saw that the very foundation of the whole Papal system was assailed; and that there was a power in the voice and the movement, even as if from heaven, that they could not withstand.—It needs not that I here retrace what has been said before so fully of the subsequent successive steps taken towards the consolidation of the Reformation:—the recognition by Luther in their true character, and consequent rejection, of the Pope and his seven Thunders; his intrepid standing up in defence of the Gospel before the Emperor and Cardinals at Worms; the general revival of gospel-preaching; the ecclesiastical constitution of a pure and reformed Church, and excommunication of the Roman Church as apostate, with the rod of the civil power assisting, throughout electoral Saxony, Prussia, Denmark, Sweden, and other countries. It is sufficient here to state that at each step of advance, as the revival was confirmed, and the Witnesses stood more firmly on their feet, the fears of those that beheld continued, and increased in anxiety. Not the least were their fears excited when, after ten years of vain schemes and agitation to put them down, the *Lutheran Reformers* proclaimed as it were before the world,—though all unconsciously and unintentionally,—that they were but the *Witnesses of Christ* resuscitated and risen up again:—I mean when in 1530, just after the memorable Augsburg Council, at which they had presented their Confession of Faith, and been repudiated by the Emperor, they united them-

¹ "Brother Martin," he said, "is a man of fine genius." Milner.

selves collectively at *Smalcald*,¹ under the glorious adopted name of PROTESTANTS; an appellation the very same that, according to its Latin etymology, signifies WITNESSES.

And here the Angel seems to have ceased speaking.—(I shall presently have to state the evidence of it.) His sketch of the two Witnesses' history had been brought down to that very chronological point in the vision prefigurative of the Reformation, at which He first interposed with his retrospective explanatory narrative. What remained of their history would most fitly be given, not retrospectively, or in explanatory narrative, but in the resumption and progress of the Apocalyptic scenic figurations. To these we now proceed. They will form the subject of our next Chapter.

CHAPTER IX.

ASCENT OF THE WITNESSES, AND POLITICAL ESTABLISHMENT OF THE REFORMATION.

“And I heard² a great voice from heaven saying unto them, Come up hither! And they ascended up to heaven in the cloud:³ and their enemies beheld them. And at the same time⁴ there was a great earthquake. And the tenth part of the city fell. And in the earthquake were slain seven chiliads,⁵ names of men.—And the remnant were affrighted.—And they gave glory to the God of heaven.” Apoc. xi. 12, 13.

It will be observed that I adopt the reading *ἤκουσα*, *I heard*, instead of *ἤκουσαν*, *they heard*, the reading in the

¹ “The Papists in Germany are filled with fear. As we returned from the assembly at Smalcalden, the priests at Erfurt inquired what was there concluded, whether for their ruin or safety.” Luther's Table Talk, ii. 29.

² The reading *ἤκουσα* is taken, for reasons given presently.

³ ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ. ⁴ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. Griesbach has *ἡμέρα*. ⁵ χιλιάδες ἑπτα.

authorized translation, at the heading of this passage. My reason is this. The *external* evidence of Manuscripts and versions in so far favours it, that Griesbach places it in his margin as of perhaps equal authority¹ with the received *ἤκουσαν*. Then we have this *analogical* evidence in its favor, that whereas there are above 20 examples of *ἤκουσα* elsewhere in the Apocalyptic prophecy, there is not one of *ἤκουσαν*. The prefigurative characters shadowed out before the apostle's eye in vision are no where described as *hearing* what passed on the Apocalyptic scene. They often spoke words indeed; and at times had words addressed to them.² But it was all, as well as the distinctive guise they wore, for the *apostle's* seeing, the *apostle's* hearing.—Thus, I think, the Reader will agree with me that there is reasonable ground for preferring the *former*, as the true reading.

The value of the observation consists in this, that it determines a point, otherwise indistinctly defined, of much importance; viz. where it is that the descended Angel of the Covenant ends his elucidatory retrospective narrative, and that the Apocalyptic figurations recommence before St. John, in their usual form and course. For supposing the reading *ἤκουσα*, *And I heard*, to be the correct one, it marks of itself their recommencement. Other sounds now fell upon his ear that were to be recorded, other objects called for his regard on the Apocalyptic scene, in place of the voice and address of the Covenant-Angel.³—At any rate the transition cannot be fixed earlier than the clause next before preceding, “And after

¹ So Scholz also. In Mr. Tregelles' late Critical Edition of the Apocalypse, twenty-four manuscript codices are mentioned as exhibiting the reading *ἤκουσα*, and also the Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, and Arabic versions;—versions probably of the 3rd, 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries.

² For example, they *spoke* in the songs of thanksgiving: again *words were addressed to them* under the third Seal, “I heard a voice saying, See that thou defraud not in the wine and the oil:” and under the fifth Trumpet, “It was said to them that they should not injure the grass.” Apoc. vi. 6, ix. 4.

³ “And after the three days and a half, the spirit of life from God entered into them; and they stood upon their feet: and great fear fell on them which saw them.”

“Huc usque,” says Tichonius, after notice of the three and a half days of the Witnesses lying dead, “Angelus futurum narravit, et inducit factum quod factum audit.”

the three and a half days the Spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet, and great fear fell on those that beheld them ;” for the characteristic *future tense* of the Angel’s discourse occurs immediately before it :¹ nor later than the clause next after following ; for there and then the cloud that mantled the discoursing Angel, (so we shall see presently,) and of course the Angel with it, is said to have ascended upward from the Evangelist’s presence.

And hence a new and twofold historical testing of the correctness of our historical exposition of this part of the prophecy. For 1st the Angel’s retrospective sketch of the Witnesses in the *figuration*, and the Protestant Reformers’ retrospective view of them in the *reality*, may be supposed to have been brought up to near about the time when the view was taken : i. e. as we saw some long time since,² to the epoch of the researches of Bale, Foxe, Flacius Illyricus, &c ; researches begun soon after the ecclesiastical constitution of the Reformed Church with the delegated *ἐαβδος* of ecclesiastical authority, about 1542 or 1543 :³ 2ndly the prefigurations next exhibited ought to answer to the events of importance next after that date ensuing in Protestant Christendom. Now how well our exposition stands the first criterion will already have struck the reader. For the last point noted in the *Angel’s retrospective narrative*, viz. the two Witnesses’ firm standing upon their feet,⁴ to the dismay of their

¹ *δωρα πεμψοσι*. The future is in all the manuscripts.

² See p. 191 *suprà*.

The ecclesiastical constitution of the Reformed Church was begun and carried on, we saw, from A. D. 1525 to 1529, on the mandate of the governing authorities, in Saxony and other adjoining countries ; and completed, we may perhaps say, by the solemn promulgation of its principles in the Confessions of faith of those reformed Churches presented to the Emperor and Diet, A. D. 1530, at Augsburg.

³ Foxe’s researches into ecclesiastical history, which expanded at length into his Martyrology, began as early as 1543. See his Biography in the English Reformers, p. 1.—Bale published his “Image of both Churches,” or Apocalyptic Exposition, about that same year. In his list of Witnesses so far martyred, in illustration of the Apocalyptic passage on the death of the Witnesses, the latest named by him is Dr. Barnes, martyred A. D. 1541.

⁴ The force of this expression is illustrated by Ezek. xxxvii. 10, “They lived and stood upon their feet ;” said of the Jews’ future restoration in national strength and vigour.

enemies, after a sudden and most marvellous revivification from a state of death, was shown to have had fulfilment in the consolidation and firm attitude of the reformed body, when leagued together under the name of *Protestants* or *Witnesses*: a union of defence against the hostile decree of the Augsburg Diet,¹ consolidated ere the end of the year 1530 at Smalcald, and which lasted in force (so as to include the years 1542, 1543) some fifteen or sixteen years after.² Again, that the new prefiguration, introduced by the words, “And I heard,” takes up the threads of either preceding prophecy, and, interweaving them, carries forward conjointly the further prophetic development of their grand and common subject, the REFORMATION, will appear just as clearly as we proceed.

“And I heard a great voice from heaven saying unto them, Come up hither! And they ascended up to heaven in the cloud: and their enemies beheld them.” So begins the narrative of the resumed figurations. After which follows; “And at the same time there was a great earthquake. And the tenth part of the city fell. And there were slain in the earthquake seven chiliads, names of men.” Thus in this prefiguration there were three things noted:—the *Witnesses’ ascension*; the *falling of a tenth part of the Papal City*, in a great earthquake cotemporary;—and the *slaying of seven chiliads* in the earthquake. Each of these demands its separate consideration. And,

I. THE WITNESSES’ ASCENSION TO HEAVEN.

Now there is a passage in Isaiah xiv. 13, which very

¹ See the close of the preceding chapter.

² Let me illustrate from Bale’s own comment on that clause, “And after the three and a half days,” &c. He says: “In the midst of their joy and triumph, when they (the Papists) think themselves well quieted, the heretics thus taken away, another storm falleth on them worse than the other. Many more ariseth out of their ashes, to their confusion, and to the chosen’s comfort: and the same Witnesses are again giving the same testimony, though they be not the same persons.” So far he explains the prophecy with reference to times past, and the time then present. Then he begins to expound of what *would* be: “These witnesses stood upon their feet. In the time full past was this spoken for the certainty of the thing; *though much of it be to come.*”

clearly sets forth to us the meaning of the symbol here made use of. The king of Babylon is there represented as saying in his heart, "I will ascend into heaven: I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High. The *heaven* noted in my text (a heaven visible to the enemies of the Witnesses,¹ and therefore not the spiritual heaven of the Divine presence,) is evidently here, as in Isaiah, the heaven of political power and dignity; the *ascent thither*, an advancement to political dignity and power;² and the *call*,—the *loud* call of summons from thence, a call from persons, highest for the time being in political authority.—Such seems the clear meaning of the prefigurative symbols. But could it be that the *Witnesses* so late made war against, even to extermination, by the Wild Beast from the abyss, i. e. the popes and secular powers of Western Christendom under them and moreover by delegates from every part of Western Christendom rejoiced over when apparently dead, and after their resuscitation persecuted afresh by hostile decrees, as at Worms and Augsburg,—could it be, I say, that they should by any of these powers be called up, and that with a voice audible through all Europe, to political ascendancy and power?—It needs but little acquaintance with modern history to know that such was indeed the very fact; and within little more than 20 years from the anti-Protestant Decree of Augsburg.

It was the embroilment with other nations of Charles the Vth, head of the Germanic Empire,—that great secular power on which the Popes most trusted to crush the rising heresy,—that God's all-ruling Providence made

¹ For it is said both of their ascent, and of themselves after it, "And their enemies beheld them."—The Reader may refer back, if he please, to some observations on the firmamental heaven of the Apocalyptic landscape in Vol. i. pp. 102, 103.

² The figure of *ascent into heaven*, in the sense of triumph and exaltation, was, like others in the passage before us, adopted unconsciously in the 5th Lateran Council. In the conclusion of Cardinal Caietan's oration in the 2nd Session we find the words; "Sic namque hoc sacrosanctum Concilium *in cælum ascendet*, cùm Catholicâ Ecclesiâ quam refert; et quam Johannes Civitatem esse Sanctam, esse Jerusalem, novamque, atque de cælo descendisse, contemplatus est." Hard. ix. 1623.

use of, (it is always instructive to trace its mode of operation,) as the primary means for effecting this predicted consummation. Scarce had two years elapsed after the passing of the Augsburgh Decree, when the imminency of a long-threatened Turkish invasion under the terrible Sultan Solyman, made the reconciliation of the Protestant States a point of obvious necessity to the preservation of the empire: ¹ and induced from the Emperor and Germanic Diet a Decree, celebrated as the *Pacification of Nuremberg*; by which Decree full toleration was accorded to Protestantism, and a stop put to all suits against Protestants in the Imperial Supreme Chamber, *until the assembling*, then shortly expected, of a *General Council*. Thus, says Robertson,² “from having been viewed hitherto only as a religious sect, the Protestants came thenceforth to be considered as a political body of no small consequence.” It was their first great step, and that on *the Imperial call, to political ascendancy*.—The embroilment with Turkey was followed by others of longer duration with France, and then with France and Turkey conjointly:—embroilments marked on the historic page by Charles’ expeditions against Tunis and Algiers, and successive invasions of France on the side of its Southern and Northern Provinces. Nor, notwithstanding some intervening truces, did the Emperor feel himself sufficiently disembarassed to attempt the reduction of the Protestants,—though by their firm attitude of independence they almost as much offended him, as by their religious heresy (so called) the Pope,—until the *Peace of Crespy* with the French King in September 1544.³—Concurrent with all this was the operation of the reluctance of two successive Popes ⁴ to the assembling of a General Council: as it delayed that which, by the terms of the Nuremberg Decree, was to constitute the terminating limit to the toleration of Protestants then agreed on. So that, in effect, for not less than 13

¹ See Robertson’s Charles the Vth for the history.

² *Ib.* Book V. ad ann. 1532.

³ *Ib.* Books V, VI, VII.

⁴ Clement VII, Cousin to Leo X, and Paul III; the former Pope from 1523 to 1534, the latter from 1534 to 1549.

years, viz. from 1532 to 1545, the *Pacification of Nuremberg* continued in force in their favor: ¹ and the only Decrees of Emperor or Diet in the interval,—I mean especially that of *Kadan*, agreed to in 1534 between the Emperor's brother and Protestant Prince of Hesse, ² and that of the Emperor himself and Diet of Spire issued early in 1544,—these, I say, instead of contravening or abridging the favorable enactments of Nuremberg, did but confirm and enlarge them.—But after the Peace of Crespy all was changed. The time was deemed by the Emperor to have come for the subjugation of the Protestants. Their requisition for recognition and toleration, not temporarily or contingently, (so as before *till the meeting of a General Council*,) but absolutely and permanently was rejected. A hostile Decree followed against them. And just after two memorable though very different events had occurred, as if in preparation (so the Romanists might have deemed) for the subjugation of Protestantism in Germany,—I mean the assembling of *the Council of Trent* in January 1546, and the *death of Luther* in the February following, ³—the threatened war broke out: and the Protestants being defeated at Muhlburg, ⁴ and their chiefs the Saxon Elector and Prince of Hesse, made prisoners and detained in captivity, and the *Interim* anti-Protestant ⁵ Decree soon after promulgated, (the date was May 15, 1548,) it seemed as if not only the predicted ascend-

¹ It was in this interval, being in the year 1540, that the order of *Jesuits* was instituted. On which see Robertson *ibid.* ad ann. 1540, and Ranke's *History of Popes* (Austin's Translation) B. ii. c. i. § 4 and 7; also the late Reprint of the *Constitutions of the Order*.

² Ranke particularly notices this *Treaty of Kadan*. "It may be regarded," he says, "as the second great epoch of the rise of the Protestant power in Germany;" B. i. c. 3. p. 123. In it there was contained the important article that the Supreme Court (the *Kammergericht*) should hear no more suits concerning *confiscated church-property*.

³ It happened peacefully at his native place *Eisleben*. I have a medal before me struck on the occasion: which on the one side bears the face of Luther with his eyes closed in death; on the obverse the Legend round the margin, "In manus tuas commendo spiritum meum: Redemisti me, Deus veritatis:" and in the body the distich,

Nona bis obscuro lux Februa constitit ortu,
In patrio ut moreris, clare Luthere, solo.

It was indeed a marvel that a peaceful death should have been Luther's lot; and this in his native country and village?

⁴ Apr. 24, 1547.

⁵ Though little indeed agreeable to the Romanists. See my Note p. 375.

ancy of Protestantism, but even the Protestant cause itself, was put in jeopardy throughout all Germany.—But in this case, just as so often in others, the epoch of depression, through God's gracious overruling for his people, did but precede and introduce that of more conspicuous elevation. New and unexpected agencies were suddenly brought into operation. The betrayer of the Protestant cause in the war just ended, Prince Maurice, was led to espouse it. (Let it be remembered that it is with the *political* bearing of the subject that I am now dealing.) Then followed the surprize of the Emperor Charles at Inspruck, and the consequent *Peace of Passau*, concluded August 12, 1552: that celebrated Peace (confirmed in 1555 at Augsburg) whereby in the fullest measure toleration was accorded to Protestantism; and Protestants, equally with Romanists, admitted to sit as judges in the Supreme Imperial Chamber. In short it was the fulfilment of the Apocalyptic prefiguration of the Witnesses' ascent into the political heaven in *Germany*,—*Germany*, the originating locality, under God, of this great Revolution; and followed by their elevation almost coterminously in some other countries, of which I shall speak presently.¹—Nor, with reference to this consummation in the Germanic empire, must we overlook the predictive statement, “And *their enemies beheld them.*” It seemed to pre-intimate the presence of enemies on occasion of the Witnesses' *ascension*, just as before on occasion of their *resurrection*: even as if the result would be accomplished in the face of these enemies, and in spite of them. And so it was. At the passing of each Decree by which the Protestants rose into ascendancy, their enemies were present in the Diets and the Councils. As they sate in elevation afterwards in the Imperial Chamber, still their enemies were present, and beheld them.² This made the triumph more remarkable. Their language of thanksgiving might well have been that of one that was a wit-

¹ See the next head.

² “Throughout the whole of the Austrian dominions the Protestants stood armed with their old provincial rights, *face to face* with the Government.” So Ranke ii. 96, of the somewhat later year 1580.

ness for God in other and earlier times ; “ Thou hast prepared a table for us *in the presence of our enemies.*”¹

There remains yet one point for remark in the description of the ascent of the Witnesses ; I mean the circumstance of their ascent being “ *in the cloud.*” I say *in the cloud* ; for though our translators have rendered it “ *in a cloud,*” the original is as I have given it, εν τη νεφελῃ ; “ And they ascended up to heaven in the cloud.”²—Now on this adoption of the definite article in the clause Bishop Middleton has remarked as most singular. “ No cloud,” he says, “ has been mentioned : yet there is not any instance in the New Testament in which νεφελῃ has the article *without reference.*” But is it the case, I must ask, that no cloud, to which reference might be intended, has been before mentioned ? Was it not in the *robing of a cloud* that Jesus descended on the Apocalyptic earth before St. John, in the vision of the xth chapter symbolizing the Reformation ? And, as there is no mention made afterwards of his divesting Himself of it, must it not be understood that it was still in this same robing that He did all that was subsequently noticed of Him on the Apocalyptic scene :—that invested in it He swore that mighty oath about the time of the consummation ; in it gave the opened gospel-book to his disciple ; in it, after placing the rod in his hand, commissioned him to measure the temple ; in it began and continued the narrative of the Witnesses, only just before terminated ? Assuredly such is the case : and as it is so, “ *the cloud* ” here mentioned, with the definite article, must needs be this self-same cloud of the covenant-Angel’s investiture.—But if so, why specified, it may be said, in the prophecy ? The object, I conceive, was two-fold : 1. to show that the ascent of the witnesses was the result, the terminating result, of Christ’s special intervention ; 2. to identify yet further, and more ex-

¹ Psalm xxiii.—Compare too Gen. xvi. 12 : “ He (Ishmael) shall be a wild man ; his hand shall be against every man, and every man’s hand against him : and he shall dwell in the presence of his brethren :” his *hostile* brethren.

² There is no various reading.

plicity, the cause and triumph of the *witnesses* with that of the *Reformation*.

It is added, “And at the same time¹ there was a *great earthquake*.” The events that have just been detailed involved of course a schism (and a mighty schism it was²) of those countries from the Papacy in which Protestantism had been established as the State-religion ; —viz. of Saxony, Prussia, Sweden, Denmark.—It was observable however of all these countries, (and the fact is certainly somewhat singular) that they alike lay to the North of the Danube, the boundary line in that part of the old Roman empire.³ But the mighty moral and political revolution begun in Saxony, was destined almost immediately to extend further, and into other countries ; and, together with the *ascent of Protestantism* there also, to involve the downfall and destruction of one, indeed of more than one,—very remarkable part of what is called in the Apocalyptic prophecy the Great City. “And the tenth part,” it says, “of the city fell : and there were slain in the earthquake seven chiliads, names of men.”—The development of this was to be the subject of our *second Head*.

II. THE OVERTHROW OF A TENTH PART OF THE CITY, AND THE SLAYING OF SEVEN CHILIADS.

I. *The fall of the tenth part of the city*. “And the tenth part of the city fell.”—To understand the intent of this prediction, nothing more seems necessary than to remember that the Great City included in its empire just *ten kingdoms* ;⁴ and that the word *fall* is used in prophecy with reference to cities or countries conquered, and transferred to the dominion of a triumphant enemy.⁵

¹ εν εκεινη τη ωρα. Griesbach has ημερα : but I prefer the authorized text ; as does also Mr. Tregelles. And I render it, “At that *time*,” because ωρα is generally used in the Apocalypse in that sense.

² So Dr. Lingard ; “That *religious revolution* which astonished and convulsed the nations of Europe.”

³ See Vol. i. p. 331.

⁴ See Apoc. xvii. 12 : and my historical elucidation in Part IV, chap. iv. § 2 *infra*.

⁵ So Isaiah xxi. 9, of the *fall* of the ancient Babylon, on its capture by the

It was the conquest and overthrow of the Papal empire in one of these ten kingdoms, apparently, that was the thing predicted. As to the hostile power by which it was to be overthrown, I think the context indicates that this would not be, (so as in the judgments on "the third part of men" noticed in the viiith and ixth Apocalyptic chapters,) *Mahometan* or *heathen* invaders: ¹ but rather the aggression of *Protestantism*, that most terrible of all enemies to Papal imposture; this being that from which the *earthquake*, or great political schism that has been spoken of, had its origin.² So that we have only to turn to history for the solution of the question: and to ask; Was there any one of the ten kingdoms of Papal Christendom,—and, if so, which,—wherein, about the same time as the great political exaltation of the Protestants in Northern Germany, the Papal Empire fell, overthrown by Protestantism?

And in answer to the question, does not history, as with a finger-point, direct the inquirer to *England*? to England one of the most notable of the ten Papal kingdoms?—The story of the great revolution that now befel it is soon told. By the teaching of certain Lutherans that visited its shores soon after Luther's return from his Patmos, in fulfilment of the commission given to him and them,—“Thou must prophesy before many kings, nations, and languages,”—by the teaching, I say, of these, and of such few survivors too as might remain of the *Wicliffites* or *Lollards*, the minds of not a few of the English had been secretly preparing for the change. But in this case *their* agency was at first less conspicuous

Persians: “There cometh a chariot with a couple of horsemen. And he answered and said, Babylon is fallen, is fallen and all the graven images of her gods he hath broken to the ground.” That the overthrow of the ancient Babylonian power in Babylon by the *Persians* was the event intended, appears from what is said of the agents in verse 2; “Go up O *Elam*! Besiege O *Media*!”

¹ Apoc. viii. 9, ix. 18.

² It is observable that *Jurieu*, supposing that *France* was the tenth part of the city here intended, and that the prophecy had yet in his time to receive its fulfilment, expressed his expectation that “the Revolution would be effected by a *Protestant prince* being given to France; by whom the witnesses should ascend into heaven or power, and the Papists be affrighted.” *Vütringa*, too, who similarly regarded the prophecy as unfulfilled, expressed a similar opinion on the manner of the fulfilment of the επεσε.

and effective. Ostensibly the political movement had here precedence of the spiritual. God is a wonderful worker ; and overrules alike the most opposite principles and characters to effect his own purposes. The imperious and licentious Henry VIII was, at the time of Luther and the Reformation, king of England. In the year 1520 he had actually come forward to dispute with Luther, as the champion of the Papacy. Ere ten years had past, other motives swayed him. Dissatisfied with his marriage with Queen Catherine, and doubtful of its lawfulness, he sued the Pope for a divorce. Unsuccessful, and revolted by the chicanery of Rome, he summoned his Parliament. Then the memorable Act was passed by which *Papal supremacy* was renounced in England, and the king declared head (temporal head) of the church. So did *Papal England* fall in the earthquake; i. e. the Papal Empire in England.¹—In point of *time* the event synchronized with the earlier steps of the German Protestants towards ascendancy: the *first threatening* of separation between Henry and the Pope being in 1529, just when the German reformers united under the name *Protestants*; and the *Act of Parliament* past in 1534, the year of the *Treaty of Kadan*; a year noted by Ranke as the second epoch of the rise of the Protestants in Germany.—As yet, however, Protestantism was not established in England. Through the remainder of the reign of Henry, Popery lay in ruins; but no edifice of real evangelical Protestantism was erected in its stead. But in Edward the 6th's reign, which quickly followed, and lasted just till a little after the Treaty of Passau, viz. from 1546 to 1553, this blessed consummation was effected. The English Protestant evangelic Church, thanks be to God, was fully organized and established. The bloody Mary, on succeeding, for a few years threatened its subversion, and the restoration of Popery. But

¹ So Mosheim, xvi. i. 3. 11, 12, speaks of the pillars of Popery being shaken in England, and *the downfall of the Papal authority* in England!

Britton marks the day. "In the Parliament which commenced its Session Nov. 3, 1534, the important statute was past, by which all Papal authority in ecclesiastical affairs was 'utterly abolished out of this realm.'"

a speedy death terminated her projects. The sufferings and constancy of the Marian martyrs only the more endeared the Reformation to the hearts of the people. The reign of Elizabeth followed. The half-reconstructed *tenth of the Papal City* fell again.¹ And the *witness* or *Protestant* church of England was then fully fixed in the heaven of political exaltation : where it has ever since remained.²

2. A further result of the earthquake is thus predicted ; “ And there were slain in it *seven chiliads, names of men.*”³

The reader will observe that it is not the numeral adjective *ἑπτακισχιλιοι* that is here used ; but, *ἑπτα χιλιαδες*, *seven chiliads*, or *thousands*. This is a point important to be observed ; being that, on which, as I doubt not, the true solution of the prophetic intimation turns.

For if we look to the use of the word *χιλιας* in the Septuagint, or rather that of its Hebrew original *הָאֲלָפִים*, we shall find that it constituted the most notable *popular subdivision* in the Jewish commonwealth under the larger division of a tribe.—It seems that it was first introduced into the Israelitish administrative system by Moses in the wilderness. We read in Exodus xviii, that he was counselled to divide the nation into *thousands, hundreds, and tens*, by his father-in-law Jethro ; in order to the appointment over each of rulers and officers, who might relieve him in part of the intolerable weight that fell on him of judicial and administrative business. “ So Moses ;” it is said, “ chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people ; *rulers of thou-*

¹ In the Zurich Letters we have one from Jewel to Peter Martyr, on the return of the former to England after Elizabeth's accession, dated March 20, 1559, thus illustratively describing the then state of things : “ The Roman Pontiff, I found on my return, was not yet *cast out* : * no part of religion was yet restored : the country was still desecrated by the mass : the pomp and insolence of the bishops was unabated. All these things however are at length beginning to shake, and about to *fall*.” p. 10, Parker Ed.

² See Burnet's History of the Reformation on the general subject.

³ *Και απεκτανθησαν εν τω σεισμῳ ονοματα ανθρωπων χιλιαδες ἑπτα.*

* “ But the court that is without *cast out*.” See my p. 179 *suprà*.

sands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens." Henceforth the *chiliad*, which numerically averaged about one fiftieth of a *tribe*, became a most notable subdivision in Israel: ¹ and the *rulers of thousands* are mentioned, after the *heads of tribes*, as among the high officers of the host. They seem scarcely however at first to have attained to the dignity of being enrolled, and *called by name*, as members of the great national Council. It is of the *phylarchs*,² or *heads of tribes*, distinctively, that the statement is made on the first numbering of Israel near the Mount of Sinai; "These were the *renowned* (literally the *called by name*) of the congregation, princes of the tribes of their fathers, heads of thousands in Israel. And Moses and Aaron took these men which were *expressed by names*."³ The *chiliad* in this instance was not, as yet, in the *highest* sense of the word, an *ονομα ανθρωπων*, or *distinctive title* of the men that ruled it.—On the settlement of Israel however in the land of Canaan two changes passed on the *chiliad*:—*first*, its *numerical augmentation*; the tribe multiplying, while the number of *chiliads* in the tribe remained the same (as seems probable,) each of them embracing the families originally numbered in it: ⁴—*secondly*, its *territorial endowment*: a portion of territory belonging to the tribe

¹ So in Numbers x. 36. "And when the ark rested, Moses said, Return, O Lord unto the many thousands (*χιλιαδας μυριαδας*, the innumerable *chiliads*) of Israel."

² The Septuagint has, in regard of these chieftains, an indistinctness of designation which is not in the original. For it calls them *chiliarchs*, as well as *heads of tribes*; for example in Numb. i. 16, quoted above, and Josh. xxii. 14: whereas the original, rendered *χιλιαρχος* (*chiliarch*) in the Septuagint, is *ראש אלפיים*, the head of *thousands*, not of a *thousand*.

³ Sept. *της ανδρας τετεις της ανακληθηεντας εξ ονοματος*.

⁴ So Gesenius gives as the second meaning of *אלפיים*; "Family, subdivision of a tribe; consisting originally of a *thousand*, but afterwards without any reference to that number, i. q. *במשפחה*." He cites, among other examples, Judges vi. 15; "Behold my family," or *chiliad*, *אלפיים*, (it is *Gideon* that is speaking) "is poor in Manassch, and I am the least in my father's house:"—also 1 Sam. x. 19; "Present yourselves before the Lord by your tribes, and by your *thousands*:" a passage followed by an account of the Israelites assembling accordingly; and first the *tribe* of Benjamin being taken, then out of that tribe the *אלפיים* or *chiliad* of *Matri*; then out of that *chiliad* the *family* of *Kish*, and *Saul* as the *individual* of the family:—also 1 Sam. xxiii. 23; "If he be in the land I will search him out, throughout all the *thousands* of Judah."

being allotted to each one of its constituent chiliads ; so that, like the *hundred* in an English county, these chiliads became identified with *districts* ; each with its little capital, or chief town or village, included in it.¹—It would seem too as if the *chiliarch* now derived from his *chiliad* more of the *ονομα*, i. e. a higher name and station in the commonwealth ; being so noted both in Zech. ix. 7² and in St. Matthew's version of the prophecy in Micah. For the Evangelist's, "Thou art not the least among the *princes* (*εν ἡγεμοσιν Ιουδα*) of Judah,"³ is in the Hebrew original, as observed in a Note preceding, "the least among the *chiliads* of Judah."

Such being the *Jewish original*,—and the propriety of explaining the *chiliads* here mentioned by reference to *this* original being evidenced by the previous Apocalyptic exhibition of the population of Roman Christendom under the symbol of the *twelve tribes of Israel*,⁴—all that we have to do, in order to the solution of the prophetic clause before us, is to enquire for some *septenary of subdivisions*, popular and territorial, in the commonwealth of Western Christendom ; which, bearing proportion thereto each one somewhat the same as the Hebrew chiliad to all Israel, and constituting therein more markedly than their prototype titles of high office, dignity, and command, were conjointly destroyed *as members of the Papal body* ; (*political slaughter* being here, as elsewhere,⁵ the apparent meaning of *αποκτεινω* ;)—destroyed in the same political earthquake attendant on the Reformation in the which Papal England fell ; by the same hostile agency too, it would seem in the main, viz. that of Protestantism ; and not very long after it in time.—

¹ So Gesenius, exemplifying from the well-known passage in Micah v. 2 ; "Thou *Bethlehem Ephratah*, though thou be little among the *thousands* of Judah," &c : (Sept. *ολιγοστος ει εν χιλιασιν Ιουδα*) Bethlehem being the designative and chief village of that particular *chiliad-district* in Judah.

² "And he shall be for our God, and he shall be as a *governor* (Hebr. *אֶלְהֵךָ*, Sept. *χιλιαρχος*) in Judah."

³ Matt. ii. 6.

⁴ Apoc. vii. See Vol. I. pp. 229—232.

⁵ *απεκτανθησαν*. Compare Apoc. ix. 5, 15, 18, 20, where the *slaying of the third part of men*, is said of the *political extinction* of the Greek empire.—So also Ezek. xxxvii. 9 ; "Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, (i. e. on the Jews slain as a *nation*,) that they may live."

Such are the prophetic conditions that have to be satisfied in history. Nor, as we look therein for the fulfilment, does it seem to me possible to mistake its directing us to that memorable revolution, by which, during the English Queen Elizabeth's reign, the *seven Dutch United Provinces* were emancipated from the Spanish yoke, and at the same time the Papal rule and religion destroyed in them.—Let us consider the case, and compare.

For their first constitution then as *provinces*, we must refer back to the early record of the invasion and conquest of Roman Gaul by the Frankish tribes. The *Netherlands*, including what was in later times called *French Flanders*, as well as *Dutch Flanders*, formed part of the new Frank empire; and were soon divided into seventeen Provinces, constituting as many partially independent states, fiefs of the empire; viz. the four *Duchies* of Brabant, Limburg, Luxemburg, Guelders, the *Marquisate* of Antwerp, the seven *Counties* of Flanders, Artois, Hainault,, Namur, Zutphen, Holland, Zealand, and six *Lordships* of Malines, Utrecht, Overysse, Friesland, Groningen: ¹—each being an *allodium*, or territorial domain, assigned to some chieftain and subdivision of a tribe in nearly independent sovereignty, just like the *territorial chiliads* assigned to the tribal subdivisions of *Israel* on its settlement in Canaan; and furnishing to the chief, whether as its *Lord*, *Count*, *Duke*, or *Marquis*, his title of dignity and command.²—In the course of the 700 years that intervened between Charlemagne and Charles the Vth, many changes of course occurred affecting them. In the xvth century at length they had become attached to the Dukedom of Burgundy, then passed by marriage to the Austrian Emperor Maximilian, and so to his grandson Charles V, and afterwards his great grandson Philip the IInd: but

¹ Rees' Cyclopædia. Art. *Netherlands*.—Cambresin was afterwards added, making eighteen.

² See Watson's *Philip the Second*, Book 3, ad init.—Also on the *allodia* and *beneficia* allotted to the chieftains by the superior Head, Robertson's *Charles V*, Appendix, Note F.

still as Provinces separate and distinct; the titles of dignity and command, *ονοματα ανθρωπων*.¹

Now into these Provinces of the Netherlands the doctrines of the Reformation soon found their way. Ere the year 1524 Luther had the satisfaction to hear, not only of the gospel being preached in them, but of martyrs sealing the truth of what was preached with their blood.² Still the leaven worked, the new opinions continued to spread, and martyrs to suffer in the Netherlands; ³ though the fires of the Inquisition, and the strong arm of power, prevented a popular religious outbreak. At length under Philip the 2nd political oppressions were added to religious; and war begun.⁴ The earthquake, under which the tenth kingdom of the Popedom had just before fallen, begun to convulse and threaten its supremacy in these lesser districts. The commencement of the war was in 1569. In 1579, (the other Provinces adhering to Spain and the Papacy,) the union of the *Seven United Provinces* was formed by Deputies from Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, Friezeland, Groningen, Overyssel, Guelderland. To human eye the cause of the Protestant insurgents might well have seemed hopeless. For Philip's was the mightiest monarchy in Europe; and the seven Provinces, besides defect in all military organization and armament, bore, in regard even of *territory* and *population*, scarce so great a proportion to it as seven of the Hebrew chivalds to the largest of the tribes of Israel.⁵ But the energy and fortitude imparted to them by religion was indomitable. It was felt by the Spaniards at the sieges of Haarlem and of Leyden. Moreover the example of England, now Protestant under its Queen Elizabeth, was before them; and its sympathy and even succours at

¹ Vitringa, p. 648, construes the *ονοματα ανθρωπων* as *men of name and celebrity*. But on Apoc. iii. 4, having the same expression to explain, he makes the distinction between the phrase *men of name*, and *names of men*; "Aliud est *Nomen hominis*, ac *Homo nominis*;" and so refutes himself.

² See Milner on the year 1523, pp. 798—816.

³ It has been said that 50,000, and even 100,000, suffered as heretics, ere the insurrection broke out. So Watson, *ibid.* who cites *Meteren*, *Grotius*, and *Father Paul* as authorities.

⁴ See on all this Watson's Philip II.

⁵ In Miller's *Companion to the Atlas*, I find the following view of the *territorial*

hand. Above all, God's support was with them. His purpose had been declared that *seven Chiliads* of the Papal city, as well as one of its ten kingdoms, should be overthrown. After a protracted and bloody war of 37 years the impossibility of recovering the seven Provinces to itself and to the Popedom was fully recognized by Spain. In 1609 their independence was acknowledged by it: and out of the ruins of the *seven Papal Lordships and Counties* (now slain, just like the third of men, or Greek Christendom, in their political character) there arose the Protestant Republic of Holland.¹

extent and present population of Holland, as compared with that of those other kingdoms that made up the old Roman or Western Papal Empire.

<i>Countries.</i>	<i>Extent in Square Miles.</i>	<i>Population in Millions.</i>
U. P. of Holland	13,000	2½
Great Britain . . .	118,000	24
France	205,000	32
Spain	183,000	11
Portugal	39,000	3½
Switzerland	15,000	2
Belgium	11,000	3½
Austria	230,000	32
Italy	130,000	19

Thus the *territorial extent* of Holland is to that of the rest of Papal Christendom, within the old Roman limits of the Danube and the Rhine, as 13 to 931, or 1 to 72; its *population* as 2½ to 127, or 1 to 50.—Now, with regard to the Hebrew *chiliads*, since *one* was a 600th part of the 600,000 that constituted the whole population of the twelve tribes, when the division was made, therefore *seven chiliads* would have been to that whole population as 1 to 80; a proportion that may be supposed, in the absence of particular information, to have held also territorially.—If the other kingdoms of the Papacy, previous to the Reformation, were included in the table, I mean of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Poland, Prussia, and other States of the North of Germany, a territory would be added of above 400,000 square miles, and a population of 50 millions; making the proportion of Holland $\frac{1}{120}$ in regard of territory, $\frac{1}{50}$ in regard of population. On either reckoning there is, I believe, no Jewish *popular* or *territorial* division that would at all so nearly represent the proportion to the rest of Christendom;—i. e. of *Roman Christendom*:—*Greek Christendom* being regarded in the prophecy as politically defunct, (Apoc. ix. 18,) and so left out of the calculation.

¹ I was not aware, till long after I had concluded on the above explanation of the clause respecting the *seven chiliads*, that it had ever been proposed before. But I learn from Vitringa, p. 656, that nearly the same, and on the same ground of the use of the Hebrew word חֲלִיָּאִים, was proposed long since by the learned Cocceius. In connexion however with it, he explained the *fall of the tenth part of the city* to mean the *toleration of Protestantism in France*, after Henry the

Such were the two grand and permanent political changes in Europe, that arose out of the earthquake attendant on the Reformation.—It was fondly hoped by the persecuted French Protestants,¹ when Henry the IVth, himself at that time a professing Protestant, obtained the crown and kingdom, that the same would be the result in France. But it had not been predicted, and it took not place. King Henry, soon after his accession, abjured Protestantism. And though by his *Edict of Nantes*, promulgated in 1598, civil liberty and rights were secured to French Protestants, yet it was with certain restrictions appended that excluded the idea of the Witnesses having *there* ascended into the political heaven; and, after some 80 or 90 years, the edict was revoked by Louis XIV, and Protestants thenceforward put *out of the pale of the law* in that kingdom.—Nor let me here pass on without observing, that the predictive verse before us seems to me to embrace in its comprehensive sketch a period reaching downward as late as that selfsame memorable epoch of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.² For not until near about it did the results predicted in Northern Germany and England receive their final settlement. In 1629 the Emperor Frederic II having issued the terrible *Restitution Edict*,—an Edict by which German Protestants were required to restore to the Church of Rome all the possessions they had become masters of, in consequence of the *Religious Peace* concluded in the preceding Century,—a war arose in defence of Protestant rights, in the which Gustavus Adolphus fell victorious A. D. 1632 at Lutzen. Nor was it till 1648 that they were re-established on a firm and permanent basis by

Fourth's Edict of Nantes; and the previous *slaughter and exposure of the Witnesses* for three and a half days as their state of *persecution and depression* throughout the 1260 days;—these two periods being made by him equivalent, the three and a half years with the three and a half days.—Vitringa justly excepts against the view of France, in which Popery still held government, being the tenth of the Papal City fallen; and against the still stranger notion of 1260 days and three and a half days meaning the same period. And hence it is, I presume, and through this evident error in respect of its *adjuncts* in Cocceius, that his correct explanation (as it seems to me) of the *chiliads* came to be forgotten.—Against the exposition of the *seven chiliads* itself Vitringa has no objection to make worth the notice.

¹ So too others, as *Cocceius*. See the Note preceding.

² A. D. 1685.

the *Peace of Westphalia*. Again, in *England*, by Charles the IInd, and yet more by James his brother and successor, advances were made to the restoration of Popery : until at length in 1688, through God's gracious favor to this island, William of *Orange* superseded James the IInd in the Government. In him, at that critical conjuncture, *the seven chiliads* repaid back to *the tenth of the City* the aid they had earlier received from it in the battle of religious truth. And thus, just when Louis was ruthlessly crushing Protestantism and Protestants in France, the political establishment and elevation of Protestantism was finally secured and confirmed in England ;¹ and eventually in Holland also.²

In every case, whether in England, Holland, or Germany, "*the remnant*," or Papists that remained in them after the victorious ascendancy of Protestantism, were as, the sacred prediction describes it, *affrighted*. Penal enactments were passed against the Romanists.³ The popular feeling too was against them. Times were when they dared not shew their faces.⁴—On the other hand the ascendant Protestants,—the Witnesses in the political heaven, (for *this* seems evidently the *nominative* to the last clause of the text, not *οἱ λοιποὶ*, the affrighted remnant,⁵) *gave glory to the God of heaven*. On their de-

¹ So Ranke, iii. 181, speaks of the effect of William's expedition to England as being "the deliverance of Protestantism from the last great danger that menaced it, and to secure the English throne for ever to that Confession."

² I allude to Louis the XIVth's long-continued projects against Holland; which were mainly frustrated by its union with England under William.

³ It is to be regretted that, though the law of self-preservation justified many of the penal enactments in our kingdom, yet the duties of Christian charity were sometimes forgotten by the Protestant legislator and Protestant people.

⁴ If in "the remnant" noted, the reader prefer to include Romanists of the other unoverthrown Papal kingdoms, the history of Prince Maurice's expedition against Charles V, of the defeat of the Spanish Armada, and of sundry successes of the Dutch in their war of independence, will be found to exemplify the consternation that often affected them also. But I think the chief meaning of the *οἱ λοιποὶ* here intended is simply that given above.—Compare however the *οἱ λοιποὶ* in Apoc. ix. 20.

⁵ It is contrary to the *whole tenor* of the Apocalyptic descriptions of the enemies of Christ and of his witnesses, to represent *them as giving glory to God*. Their character, when most smarting under God's judgments, is on the contrary thus described in chap. xvi. 9: "And they repented not to give God glory." Nor does any Commentator that I have seen, advance an explanation of it (thus

liverance in England through the persecutor Mary's death and Elizabeth's accession, on the defeat of the Armada, sent to resubjugate the kingdom to Rome, and again long after on the accession of the Protestant William III, solemn thanksgivings were rendered to "*the God of heaven*:"—not, as once in England, and still in Papal countries, (for the statement is characteristic and full of meaning,) to the *Saints* or the *Virgin Queen of heaven*.¹ By sovereign and by people, it was publicly acknowledged in each case as the Lord's doing, and to Him the glory rendered.²—And as in England, so also on the Protest-

understood as it is by nearly all*) at all plausible. What are we to think, for example, of *Mr. Cuninghame's* explanatory suggestion, that "since the Reformation the Romish clergy, and even popes, have assumed a decorum of conduct and decency of morals less unbecoming ministers of Christ?" In the Council of Trent, the institution of Jesuitism, the proceedings of the Inquisition, &c, &c, was there not then exhibited an enmity against Christ's cause and Witnesses, and consequently a dishonouring of God, never exceeded?—Some, as for instance *Keith* and *Woodhouse*,† have considered this to be an insuperable difficulty; and decisive against all exposition of the Witnesses' resurrection and ascension by reference to the Reformation, or any past event.

The borrowing of a nominative, not from the sentence next, but that next but one preceding, especially if one of eminence in the general narrative, is far from uncommon; above all in the interchange of *pronouns*. Take the following examples. Gen. xv. 13; "Thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs (and they shall serve them, and *they* shall afflict them) four hundred years:" where the second *they* applies to a different nominative from the former *they*. 1 Cor. xv. 42; Οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, &c: "It is sown;" not the *ανάστασις*, or *resurrection*, but the *body*, mentioned some verses before. Also Numb. xxv. 2, 1 Kings xxii. 19, 2 Kings xxiii. 29, Isa. vii. 13, Luke xv. 15, 16, John ix. 22—24, xxi. 15, 16, Apoc. ix. 5. In my Exposition of Dan. xi. in the last Part of this Commentary, the necessity and use of this principle of interpretation of the pronoun will abundantly appear.

"*Illi dederunt claritatem Deo,*" says Tichonius on the passage, "*qui super petram ædificati sunt, et cadere non potuerunt.*"

¹ The cotemporary building of the *Escorial*, in gratitude to *St. Lawrence*, as the author of *Philip's* victory over the French, will be remembered as one of many in contrast.

² So Elizabeth on her accession and the restoration of Protestantism; "As Daniel out of the den of lions, so was I by thee alone delivered; therefore to thee only be thanks, honour and praise for ever." (Book of the Church, ch. xv.) So again Bishop Jewel in his Sermon. "All these things came to pass at such a time as to any man's reason it might seem impossible. . . . Therefore this is the day that the Lord (not man) hath wrought. It must be acknowledged the Lord's doing,

* *Mr. Faber*, I see, is an exception. He explains both this clause, and the λοιποὶ in that which precedes it, of "the Protestant remnant," contradistinctively to the Papists that were slain in the earthquake. Sac. Cal. iii. 51. But did the expression ἐμφοβοὶ ἐγενοντο, *were affrighted*, characterize the feelings of the delivered Protestants in England;" so as he explains the connected clause?

† "At none of these periods could it be said that the remnant were affrighted, and gave glory to God. For Popery continued to be the religion of the greater part of Europe, and is so at the present day." Woodhouse, p. 235.

ant successes in Germany and in Holland.¹—The notice, I repeat, is most significant. It marked a sign of the times ; a sign of the vindication of God's honour having begun.

And let me add that the echo of their triumphs and thanksgivings was wafted over the sea, both West and East, to the continents of America and Asia. For commercial and maritime power flowed in upon England and Holland ; and colonies in those distant regions were formed dependent on them, after their overthrow of the Papal religion.²—And now it began to appear why the rainbow-crowned Covenant-Angel, in his visionary descent prefigurative (as I showed) of the Reformation, was represented as planting his *right* foot on the sea, his *left* only on the mainland.³ For England, *insular England*, was already in Elizabeth's reign conspicuous as the chief bulwark of Protestantism in Europe ; and seemed preparing too, as a colonial power, to be the chief propagator of its true christian doctrine, in antagonism to the anti-christian doctrine zealously propagated by multitudinous Romish missions,⁴ beyond the seas. And at length un-

and is marvellous in our eyes." I quote from Strype's Preface to his Annals ; who adds also, among other extracts to the same effect, the following from Bishop Carleton's *Thankful Remembrance* : " Elizabeth, left as a prey to the strongest that would invade her, but preparing her heart, and *giving God the glory*, was in a few years made strong against her enemies." Further, in his chapter vii, Strype gives beautiful extracts from a Thanksgiving of the English Protestant exiles, on the same event, *addressed to Christ* : " Ad Christum Anglorum exultantium Εὐχαριστικόν."

On the defeat of the Armada, Elizabeth's going in state to St. Paul's to return thanks, is noted in Rapin, Aikin, &c. Moreover, she had a medal struck, which represented a fleet beaten by a tempest, and falling foul of each other, with this inscription, " He blew with his winds, and they were scattered." So, as Barthe says, in his Summary of History, p. 364, " When the invincible Armada had been destroyed, both the Queen and her subjects *gave God the glory* of their deliverance."

The thanksgiving for William's Accession is still in our Prayer Books.

¹ See Watson's Philip the Second, and other Histories of the Times.

² It was under Elizabeth that the first English Colony was founded in Virginia, the germ of the United States of America ; and that Sir Francis Drake circumnavigated the world. " The English," says Mosheim, xvi. ii. 4, " who towards the conclusion of this century sent colonies into the Northern parts of America, transplanted with them the reformed religion which they themselves professed : and, as their possessions were extended and multiplied from time to time, their religion also made a considerable progress among that uncivilized people."

³ See p. 38 &c. *suprà*.

⁴ It was in A. D. 1540 that the Jesuit Order was established, and its mighty

der William, its colonies having multiplied, a direct Protestant Missionary Society was instituted ;—that for the Propagation of the Gospel.—Much more was England's high missionary vocation apparent, when yet a century later, as figured in a subsequent Apocalyptic vision,¹ it gave itself to be the carrier abroad of the everlasting Gospel. Then, at length, on as mighty a scale as that of the *Papal Antichrist's* pretensions to universal dominion, already long since spoken of,² there was carried out the assertion of the claims of the *Lord Jesus Christ* to that dominion, and the declaration of his pure gospel-truth, against Papal lies, usurpation, and corruptions. It was all, I say, by the instrumentality very principally of this same favoured island-kingdom, once the tenth part of the Papal Empire :—even as if the impulse given by the Angel's foot-press still continued ; and there had never ceased within it the influence and the blessing of his visitation.

So closes the prediction of the ascent of Christ's Witnesses, and of the political establishment of Protestantism and the Reformation. It remains but to answer *an objection*, ere concluding this Chapter.—Supposing the Witnesses to have accomplished their ascent to the political heaven at the time to which I have referred it, and consequently before the termination of their appointed 1260 years of sackcloth-propheying, it follows that they must *even after their ascent* have worn sackcloth. Now can we suppose, it has been said by one,³ an *impropriety* like this *in the Apocalyptic figure* ; conjoining, as it does, the *sackcloth-robing* and the *place in heaven*, two things so incongruous ? And again by others ;⁴ Can there be that

missions commenced, under the auspices of Spain and Portugal, to the Eastern and the Western world. See Mosheim xvi. ii. 1, 2, 3.

¹ See my Part V, Ch. v. in the 3rd Volume, on Apoc. xiv. 6.

² See p. 70, &c.

³ *Elements of Prophetic Interpretation* by the Rev. J. W. Brooks, p. 459.

⁴ Alluded to by Mr. Cuninghame, p. 357.

in the *facts of the history* of ascendant Protestantism, which will reconcile such apparent inconsistencies ?

Now with regard to the alleged *impropriety of figure*, the reply seems to me quite ready at hand. Besides the general answer that the nature of symbols involves necessarily at times strange and unnatural combinations, we may point the objector to a *precise parallel* with the one here objected to, in the very next Apocalyptic Chapter.¹ There a woman (the representative of the Church) is depicted as seen *in heaven*, and yet as in that heaven *crying out from the paroxysm of pain* in her travail.²

Next as to the *fact doubted*, viz. whether after the political ascent and establishment of Protestantism, true Protestants, in other words Christ's true Witnesses, might notwithstanding have still had reason to prophesy in sackcloth, it will, if I mistake not, only need, in order to the resolution of the doubt, to suggest the two following considerations.

First, Those were not all *true* Protestants that zealously professed Protestantism, whether in England, Holland, or Germany: nor did even the same general zeal long continue in any of those countries, for the pure gospel-doctrines of Protestantism. In our own country the reign of Elizabeth had scarce ended, when efforts were made by high ecclesiastical authorities to induce a retrogradation to *semi-Popery*; and this not without disfavour to such as still held fast to the Gospel. An influx of *fanaticism* succeeded; which was followed, as might have been expected, by a too general *religious lukewarmness* and *infidelity*. Christ's witnesses were but a comparatively small and often neglected number of the church and nation; though the church itself, by its evangelic Articles and Formularies, still constituted a glorious witness-church for Christ.—The same was the religious deterioration both in Holland and Protestant Germany.—The fact is one, I believe, expressly held

¹ xii. 1, 2.

² It will be observed too that there is no notice of any putting off their sackcloth by the Witnesses, either on occasion of their resurrection, or (as Elijah) of their ascent.

forth to notice in a vision chronologically parallel with part of that which we have just considered.¹ And thus, and on this account, the Witnesses, though ascended, did yet still prophesy in sackcloth.

Secondly there is to be remembered the state of the scattered members of the witness-body in other countries of Christendom. The persecutions and oppressions *they* had to experience is a fact mournfully engraved on the page of history. In *Italy, Spain, Portugal*² they were mercilessly hunted out, destroyed, and suppressed by the Inquisition. In *Austria* the spirit of the *Restitution Edict* still animated the state-councils, even after the Peace of Westphalia: nor till the Imperial Edict of 1783 was toleration there accorded to Protestants. In *France* the *massacre of St. Bartholomew's day*, A. D. 1572, showed the feeling of both kings, nobles, priests, and people towards the Huguenots or Protestants, before Henry IV's accession and the Edict of Nantes. Even then the Edict, as we have seen, was not always acted on, though a law; and it was by Louis the 14th repealed. After which repeal the remnant of Protestants in France were a body without the pale of the law: and sad indeed is the picture drawn of their miseries, even up to the years 1788, 1790, just before and at the Revolution.³—Under these circumstances, and when such was the state of their continental Brethren, could the more favored witnesses in England, Holland, or Germany put off their sackcloth? It is well observed from Hume by Mr. Cuninghame,⁴ that after the massacre of St. Bartholomew, when the French Ambassador came to court, “nothing could be more awful and affecting than the solemnity of his audience. A melancholy sorrow sate on every face. Silence, as the dead of night, reigned through all the chambers of the royal apartment. And the courtiers, and ladies,

¹ See the Comment in my 3rd Volume on Apoc. xiv. 3.

² See M'Crie's Reformation in Italy and Spain.

³ See Wilks' *Persecution of the French Protestants*, Ch. i: also an Abstract from *Rulhiere* in No. 70 of the *Edinburgh Review*. The Edict of 1788 did but allow the Protestants in France to register; not to enjoy civil privileges.

⁴ p. 357.

ranged on either side as he passed, were *clad in deep mourning*.”—The same again was the feeling in England and Holland after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Whilst one member so suffered, how could the others but sympathize with it?—No! The 1260 days were not yet ended. Its *true* Protestant Witnesses, though participating in the national ascent of Protestantism into the political heaven, had not yet put off their sackcloth.

CHAPTER X.

TERMINATION OF THE SECOND OF TURKISH WOE, AND SOUNDING OF THE SEVENTH TRUMPET.

“THE second Woe is past: behold the third Woe cometh quickly.—And the seventh Angel sounded: and there were great voices in heaven, saying; ‘The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever.’—And the four and twenty elders, which sate before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying; ‘We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned.¹ And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead to be judged; and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth.’—And the temple of God was opened in heaven; and there was seen in his temple the ark of his covenant. And there were lightnings, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail.” Apoc. xi. 14—19.

The two subjects here described will not detain us

¹ Or “taken the kingdom:” βασιλευσας. See Vitringa.

long. The one, *the cessation of the Turkish woe*, is a prediction too plain in itself, and too plainly fulfilled in history, to need much inquiry or illustration. The other, *the sounding of the seventh Trumpet*, and anticipative sketch of the momentous events that were to result under it, will best be discussed when we come to consider the fuller development of the same events, given in a subsequent portion of the Apocalyptic Book. Thus a mere passing notice of them will for the present suffice.

I. THE CESSATION OF THE TURKISH WOE.

It deserves well to be observed how distinctly the *second half* of the Turkish woe,—I mean that measured from the fall of the Greek empire,—is Apocalyptically defined as including within it the rise, progress, and political establishment of the Reformation. It was just after the prophecy of the slaying of that third part of men, by the fire and smoke and sulphur that issued from the mouths of the Turkman Euphratean horsemen, and the ineffectiveness of the catastrophe to induce repentance in the men of the other part of Christendom, that the vision was exhibited of the descent of the Covenant-Angel, betokening the *commencement* of the Reformation. It is just after the prophecy of the political earthquake that arose out of the Reformation, and consequent fall more particularly of *the tenth part*, and of *seven chiliads* also, of the great Papal City,—in other words of the overthrow of the Papal dominion in England and in the seven Dutch Provinces, whereby was completed the *political establishment* of the Reformation,—it is not till this, I say, that there follows the statement of the text, “The second Woe is passed.”—Now the chronological correctness of this *second* prophetic intimation is as clearly verified in history as that of the *former*. Throughout the period of the earlier progress of the Reformation, the Turkish Woe continued imminent. In the course of the 20 years from 1520 to 1540 both Rhodes and Hungary in Christendom, as well as the Mameluc empire of Egypt, fell under it; and Christendom continued in

alarm. It was not till the great naval battle of *Lepanto* that any at all effectual check was interposed against its progress. And what the date of this battle? It was A. D. 1571, *just a year or two* only after the *insurrection of the Dutch Provinces*. A further check occurred in 1600, a little before the acknowledgment of the independence of those provinces; the Turks being then driven out of *Transylvania*. These however were but checks. It was not till after their great war with the German Empire in the last quarter of the xviiith century,—a war illustrated by the victories of *John Sobieski* at its commencement, and of *Prince Eugene* near its conclusion,¹—that the woe could be with any reason regarded as near its end. And this was just after the final settlement of the Reformation in England, through the accession of William III.—Even then the famous *Peace of Carlowitz* was negotiated on terms of less inequality than might have been anticipated. Its energy of aggressive progress and destruction had passed from the Turkman Empire: but it seemed still,—just like that of the Saracens, after the termination of *its* predicted 150 years of *intensity* of woe,—a mighty and formidable power. Decay however had begun irretrievably within it. And the next great war that, after a long peace with Christendom, called it again into the battle-field, I mean that of 1770 against united Austria and Russia,—a war signalized by victory after victory on the part of the allied forces, and which was ended in the year 1774 by a Peace dictated in terms by Prince Romanzoff,—proclaimed to the world in language too clear to be mistaken, that the Turkman power was no longer a *woe* to Christendom, but Christendom to the Turkmans. The dissolution or conquest of its empire had become thenceforth, it was evident, only a question of time and European policy.—The Second Woe had passed away.

¹ The war began A. D. 1673; soon after which followed John Sobieski's famous victory. In 1688 the Turkish affairs were restored by the Vizir Kiuprili. In 1697 Prince Eugene gained his great victory at Zenta. In 1698 followed the Peace of Carlowitz.

And what then next? The Apocalyptic prophecy thus announced the coming future. "The Second Woe hath passed away. *Behold the third Woe cometh quickly.*" The annunciation was followed,—doubtless after a brief pause, corresponding with the term *quickly* in the announcement,—by the *sounding of the seventh Trumpet*. It would seem that no new external judgment, no new eventful changes, worthy of Apocalyptic prefiguration, were to pass upon the face of Roman Christendom, before the breaking forth of that third Woe, the Woe of the last Trumpet: which, whether by a longer process of judgment, or a shorter, was appointed in the divine councils to prepare for, and to issue in, *the great consummation*.

II. THE SOUNDING OF THE SEVENTH TRUMPET.

Who can read the prophetic description of the events that were to occur under this Trumpet, and not be struck with their unspeakable importance and interest? "The seventh Angel sounded: and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever."—It does not appear clear, *thus far*, whether these voices were from the heavenly ones in the inmost part of the mystic Temple; or, like other voices said to sound in heaven also,¹ from servants of God elevated into the political heaven of human ascendancy and power. We may not improbably suppose the latter; and that they proceeded from the Witness or Protestant body, elevated into political ascendancy ere the close of the former Trumpet. If so, then the song would only indicate the strong prevailing impression of the times, *correct or incorrect*, as felt by what we might call the religious world of the great Protestant powers. But the song was instantly taken up by other and less equivocal voices; those of the *twenty four elders which sate before God*: the representatives, as we have

¹ Compare the song in Apoc. xii. 10, 11; which will come under consideration in my next Chapter: also the cry of the travailing woman in heaven, Apoc. xii. 2.

seen, of the spirits of the just made perfect, the church in Paradise.¹ And what said they? "They fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying; 'We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come, because thou hast taken to thyself thy great power, and assumed the kingdom. And the nations were angry; and thy wrath is come; and the time of the dead to be judged; and that thou shouldst give reward to thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldst destroy them which destroy the earth.'"—Thus by the blessed Spirits also this seventh Trumpet was recognized (and so it was indeed anticipatively referred to in the oath of the Covenant-Angel of the Reformation²) as that under which was to be indubitably accomplished that glorious event, towards which, from the earliest ages, there had been directed the prayers and longings of the saints of God;—I mean the establishment of Christ's blessed kingdom. In full certainty of this being the result, they speak of it, after the manner of prophecy, in the *past tense*,³ by preference to the *present*, even as if already accomplished. But at the same time they add words of significant import, shewing that other and awful events must first happen;—the *wrath of the nations* (the *paganized* nations⁴) of Roman Christendom, clearly against Christ and his Gospel, even as if evidenced in some paroxysm of malignity;—the out-pouring of *God's destroying wrath* upon them;—and last, not

¹ See Vol. i. pp. 87, 93.

² See p. 126 &c. *supra*.

³ Compare Exod. xv. 13; "Thou *hast guided* them in thy strength unto thy holy habitation:" said by Moses of Israel's then future but assured entrance into Canaan. So again 1 Samuel xv. 28; "The Lord *hath rent* the kingdom of Israel from thee this day &c.:" Luke i. 68, "He *hath visited and redeemed* his people:" and elsewhere not infrequently.

May I be permitted to suggest, leaving my subject for a moment, whether this principle of interpretation may not satisfactorily solve a difficulty in one of the Prayers of our Baptismal Service; a difficulty felt by those who on the one hand are persuaded that *regeneration* means a *moral* change, not a mere change of *relation* to God, and on the other hand that this moral change does not appear in most cases to have been really effected in baptism. I allude to the expression, "We thank thee that *thou hast regenerated* this child by the Holy Spirit." Faith, relying on God's promises, may realize the change I conceive as wrought; even though God still reserve to Himself the time and manner of accomplishing it.

⁴ εθνῶν. So Apoc. xi. 2.

least, the completion of the *time of the dead to be judged*, and, coincidentally with it, of that of *God's prophets and saints and servants receiving their reward*.—But what dead? What judgment? What reward?—It is not here the place to discuss the great question of the time of the *first resurrection*, of the *judgment*, and of the *appearing* and *kingdom* of the Lord Jesus Christ. But this I cannot but say on the present occasion, that,—forasmuch as no *symbolic* characters are here referred to, like as in the narrative of the two symbolic witnesses,—by “*the dead*” mentioned we seem almost constrained to understand the *dead* literally, by the *judgment* their judgment literally, and by the *reward to the saints* the reward elsewhere spoken of as to be *personally* communicated to them at Christ's coming.¹ Certainly whatever explanation would affix a figurative meaning to those striking phrases, *the dead, to be judged, reward*,² must

¹ Compare Apoc. xxii. 12, Matt. v. 12, &c.

² I may illustrate from *Launceus*, who explains *the dead* of persons *afflicted*, and as it were *given up to death*; and *Cocceius*, who refers the phrase to people once acquainted with the truth, now relapsed into the *death* of error and apostacy.

Again Grotius, Vitringa, A. Clarke, &c, explain *κρῖνειν* in the sense of *to vindicate*, and *the dead* as distinctively *the dead saints and martyrs*. Grotius cites, in support of this sense of *κρῖνειν*, Ezek. iii. 7, xvi. 37, xxiii. 24, 25. Now of all these the first is a fair specimen; “I will send mine anger upon thee, and will judge thee according to thy ways,” &c. And this evidently, instead of supporting his proposed explanation, is directly opposed to it; the sense being there not a *favorable vindication*, but a *hostile judgment*.

As the question involved is one of surpassing interest, and the passage before us one evidently of important bearing on it, I will so far anticipate my discussion of the great *millennial question*, as to give a pretty full extract from *Vitringa's* comment on the text; the ablest expounder perhaps of the *anti-premillennial* theory. “*Judicarentur mortui*. Hoc est *martyres*, qui mortem oppeterant causâ religionis, illo tempore *vindicarentur*; quod, stylo Scripturæ V. T., est *judicari*: —ut Psalm. l. 4; ‘Clamabit ad cœlos supernè, et ad terram ad judicandum populum suum;’ h. e. judicandam vindicandamque populi sui causam, et hostes ejus ulciscendos: et Psalm. lxxii. 4, de Christo; ‘Judicabit pauperes populi:’ causam illorum solenni judicio vindicabit. . . . Judicat Deus mortuos quando sanguinis martyrum, veritatis causâ oppressorum, vindicias exigit.”—Now doubtless these passages tell better than Grotius' for the sense of *κρῖνειν* advocated by them. But then the persons *judged*, in the sense of being *vindicated*, are defined in the contexts as *God's people*, or (what is tantamount to it) the *poor* or *humble ones* of the people. Where, in connexion with *general indistinctive* phrases, designative of the objects of the judgment, such as *the dead*, or *the living*, is *judged* ever used to mean *vindicated*?

Again, on the *reward* to be given to the saints Vitringa writes: “Nempè in ipsâ ecclesiâ: in et cùm quâ ipsi illo tempore gloriosè regnarent. Mortuos enim, qui in Domino occubuerunt, non sunt separati à corpore et communione ecclesiæ; quum sanè omnia bona cùm ecclesiâ habent. Illi cùm sperarint et prædixerint eventura esse tempora, quibus regnum Christi illustri modo se per totum orbem

be allowed to be unnatural *primâ facie*. And so too any which, making the 7th Trumpet to include not the momentous events alone that are preparatorily to introduce Christ's predicted reign, but the millennial reign itself, and all other events foretold as to happen beyond it, would construe what is said of the "*time of the dead having come to be judged,*" as referring to a far far distant post-millennial period, and the judgment of the great white throne not till *then* occurring.¹—Presuming however that the natural and literal sense of the clause is the true one, how near to the time now present does it seem to fix the consummation! Surely the thought cannot but be felt by us as very solemn!

As regards St. John himself, I cannot doubt but that he understood the language in its literal sense, as I do. And how must his heart have beat with desire to see the glorious things, thus anticipatively celebrated as the events of the 7th Trumpet, developed fully in the vision ensuing! But ere this development, he could not I think but also feel that one particular and most important point of information needed to be first supplied him. Who those *destroyers*, or *corrupters of the earth*,² that were now to be destroyed by God Himself from off it? Must not that *Beast from the Abyss*, which had been just once before passingly mentioned as pre-eminently the warrer against, and slayer of Christ's Witnesses,³ must not he or it be specially included in the number? But if so, what its history? Whence originating and how? Where and when established? And whether and how identical with *Daniel's fourth Beast* in its last ruling form, (for surely this thought of identity could not but suggest itself,) and consequently also with the predicted *Man of*

conspiciendum exhiberet, sensu mystico *mercedem* dicuntur *accipere*, quando his illorum prædictionibus et expectationi satisfit." p. 683.—But never, I believe, is this *mystic* sense of giving to the saints their reward, or *μισθος*,³ elsewhere found in Scripture. What should we think of the same explanation if given to parallel passages, such as Apoc. xxii. 12; "Behold I come quickly, and my reward (*μισθος*) is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be:" &c.?

¹ So Scott &c.

² *Τους διαφθειροντας την γην.*

³ Apoc. xi. 7.

Sin and Antichrist?—Behold, as if on purpose to answer these obvious questions, the forward progress of the pre-figurations is here suddenly interrupted. A new and parenthetic series of visions begins, having this for their one grand subject. And the single verse that follows, “And the temple of God was opened in heaven; and there was seen in his temple the ark of his covenant; and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake and great hail,”—a verse and scenic figuration which depicted, as I conceive, in a general way what was to happen after the Trumpet’s sounding, both as regarded the *church’s* opening or manifestation in heaven, and as regarded the commotions, wars, and earthquake that were cotemporarily to shake the *world*,—this same figured scene being, after a long and marked interruption, pointedly repeated again in Apoc. xv. 5,¹ serves well as a sign of connexion, and to show where there is a resumption of the thread of vision, and where the development of the great events of the seventh Trumpet is intended to begin. The resumed vision will call for our attention in Part v of my Commentary. The parenthetic Visions in Apoc. xii, xiii, xiv, will be the subject of my ivth and next Part.

¹ “And after that I looked; and behold the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony was opened in heaven.”

N. B. For the Papers in the Appendix referred to at pp. 9, 288, 318, in this Volume, see the Appendix in Vol. IV.

APPENDIX TO VOL. II.

I.

ON THE USE OF ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑ, DEMONS, APOC. IX. 20.

(See Page 9.)

WE have the advantage of two elaborate dissertations on this subject; the one by *Mede* in his Treatise on the Apostacy of the Last Times (Works, p. 623, &c.); the other by *Dr. Campbell*, in the sixth Preliminary Dissertation prefixed to his Work on the Gospels. It is from these, for the most part, that I abstract what follows. And I think there are two heads under which I may most conveniently class my observations from them: the first and principal having reference to the Scriptural use of δαιμονιον, more especially as contrasted with διαβολος, in both the Old and the New Testament; the *second* to its use in the *Christian Church* afterwards.

I. As to the scripture use of δαιμονια, and the distinction uniformly observed between διαβολος *devil*, and δαιμονιον *daemon*.

1. Διαβολος, *devil*, from its derivation means *an accuser*.—In this sense it is in the New Testament three times applied in the *plural*, and *without the article*, to *men* and *women* given to slander; viz. in 1 Tim. iii. 11, 2 Tim. iii. 3, Tit. ii. 3.—It is also once applied to a man in the same or a cognate sense, in the *singular*, but still *without the article*: viz. to Judas; who was probably Christ's false accuser before the Chief Priests, as well as the traitor that lay in wait for him. See John vi. 70.—But in the *singular number*, with the *article*, in which form it occurs some thirty times in the New Testament, it is uniformly used of the *One great Evil Spirit*; the same that is otherwise and associatedly called ὁ Πονηρος, Σατανας, ὁ Αντιδικος, ὁ Οφεις

ὁ αρχαιος, ὁ Δρακων μεγας, ὁ Αρχων τοῦ κοσμου τούτου, ὁ Αρχων της ἐξουσιας τοῦ αερος: i. e. The Evil One,—Satan,—the Adversary,—the Old Serpent,—the Great Dragon,—the Ruler of this World,—the Prince of the power of the air.—In its application to him it might be presumed that the term, according to its proper meaning, was intended to characterize him as an *accuser*. And such is the fact. In Apoc. xii. 9, 10, the Devil is expressly spoken of as the accuser of the Brethren, ὁ κατηγορος των ἀδελφῶν.—The fact is made clearer by reference to the *Septuagint*; from whence this, as so many other terms in the New Testament, is borrowed. It is there the equivalent of the two Hebrew words שָׂטָן and צָר, *Satan* and *Tsar*, *adversary* and *enemy*. Of the *accusatory* force of which *latter* word, its application to Haman in Esther vii. 4 and viii. 1 is proof sufficient. And that of the *former*, *Satan*, is well illustrated by its use in Job i. 6, &c., and Zech. iii. 1, 2. The course of this world is there represented as a *judicial drama*: with man's cause pending in it before the Eternal One; and the Old Serpent,—him who was originally man's *tempter*,—now acting as his *satan* or *accuser*. Indeed in the passage from Zechariah, וְהִשָּׂטָן עִמָּד עַל יְמִינוֹ לְשָׂטָנוּ, the appellative noun and its explanatory verb, occur together, “Satan to act the satan's part;” i. e. that of accuser.¹—Thus then διαβολος, *devil*, is the appellative of the *one* great evil Spirit, as, by way of eminence, our *accuser*: to whom, in the grand pending judicial drama, there is opposed, thank God, one greater, even *Jehovah Jesus*, our παρακλητος or *advocate*: our advocate in *person*, as God-man, to silence his accusations before God; our advocate by his *Spirit*, (who is thus the *Comforter*.) to silence his accusations in the believer's own conscience. There is no such word, says Dr. Campbell, as διαβολοι, *devils*, in the plural, with reference to unearthly spirits, either in the *Septuagint* or *New Testament*. And so too Dr. A. Clarke, on Psalm cvi. 37: “Devil is

¹ Just as with the Greek word διαβολος, so with the Hebrew שָׂטָן, the article is almost always prefixed where it is applied to our great adversary Satan. So in some fourteen instances in *Job*, and three in *Zechariah*, where the reference seems undoubted. The only exceptions, I believe, if such they be, are 1 Chron. xxi. 1, “And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel;” where however, some other and earthly adversary of Israel may have been intended: and Psalm cix. 6, “And let Satan stand at his right hand;” where also the reference to Satan himself seems quite doubtful.

never in Scripture used in the plural. There is but one *devil*: there are many *demons*.”

2. Next as to *δαιμονιον*, *demon*. This is a word used both in the Septuagint, and New Testament, alike in the *plural* as the *singular*, in two senses.

In the *Septuagint*, its *first* and clearest signification is as a simple designative of the *imaginary heathen gods*. So in Psalm xvi. 5; *δαιμονια εθνων ειδωλα εισιν* “the *gods* of the heathen are idols:” also in Deuteronomy xxxii. 17; *εθυσαν δαιμονιους και ο Θεος* “they sacrificed to *demons*, and not to God:” and again Psalm cvi. 37; *εθυσαν θυγατερας αυτων τοις δαιμονιους*. In these passages the Hebrew words corresponding to *δαιμονια* are *לִילִיִּם* and *לְוָדִים*: the one, according to Gesenius, signifying *vanities*, the other *lords* or *rulers*.¹ So that there is nothing in *them* to fix on these spirits the character of *devilish* or *satanic*; as the word *satanim*, or some indubitable equivalent, would have done. Nor, though the tone of the two latter statements be deemed objurgatory, does *it* need any such explanation of the word to account for it. It is sufficiently explained, on the hypothesis of its simple meaning, by multitudes of parallel Scriptural passages: in the which Israel’s sin is depicted as made up of two evils; viz. 1st, forsaking God; 2ndly, forsaking Him (not for devilish or Satanic spirits, but) for them that were *no gods*, but profitless *idol vanities*. (Deut. xxxii. 21, &c.)—Thus, there being nothing implied of devilish or Satanic in the original Hebrew, so neither, we might thence infer, in the *δαιμονια* of the Septuagint translation. Indeed the very structure of the translated sentence in the ninety-sixth Psalm excludes such a meaning. “The *devils* of the heathen are idols,” would be scarcely sense. It is plain that the Alexandrine translators used the word in its popular meaning, simply to signify the *gods* or *demons* of heathen mythology; Alexandria being a place where the Platonic philosophy had necessarily made that meaning most familiar to them.—Nor must I forget to remind the reader that there was one particular notice in the Hebrew Scriptures, on the subject of the heathen gods or demons spoken of, which must

¹ Buxtorf derives *לְוָדִים* from *וָדַר* *vastavit*: whence the word in Psalm xvi. 6, noted in the next page.

have appeared to the Seventy to make the word δαιμονια peculiarly appropriate in the translation. For just as the δαιμονια of the Greek religion were recognized by the Platonics, agreeably to the doctrine of all their older poets and philosophers, to be the spirits of *dead men*, raised to the rank of demigods,—so the Hebrew Scriptures declared that the *Baalim*, or *gods*, to whom Israel turned aside to worship, were also *dead men deified*: as it is said in Psalm cvi. 28; “They joined themselves to *Baal-peor*, and ate the *sacrifices of the dead* ;” Hebr. בַּאֲלֵימִי, Septuag. των νεκρων.—(Compare Numb. xxv. 2, 3.)—The same fact is also intimated in Isaiah viii. 19, lxx. 4; in which latter passage the heathen worship is further described as celebrated at the *tombs* of the dead.

Such is the *primary* use of the word in the Septuagint, and in passages where heathen worship is the direct subject.—Besides which, (passing over its use in the prophecies of Isa. xiii. 21, and xxxiv. 14, where the Hebrew radical is *a goat*, and the sense too obscure and disputed to rest upon,) I must just add, *secondly*, that in Psalm xci. 6, (“Thou shalt not be afraid of the destruction that wasteth at noon day,”) where the Septuagint Greek is δαιμονια μεσημβρινα, the word is used with a *malignant* sense attached to it, and apparently of some spiritual malignant being, acting destructively against man. (See Dr. A. Clarke’s Note on the Verse.)

In the *New Testament*, the word δαιμονια is similarly used in *two* senses.

First, it is used as a simple designative of the *imaginary heathen gods*. So in the narrative of St. Paul’s visit to Athens, Acts xvii. 18, 22, *directly* by the Athenians; “He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange *dæmons* or *gods* :” ξενων δαιμονιων : *impliedly* also by Paul; “I see that ye are δεισιδαιμονεστροι, very much given to worshipping δαιμονια, dæmons, heathen gods.” His comment on which, as well as on the idol-inscription he had seen, is not to be forgotten; “Him whom ye ignorantly worship (*God*, not the *devil*) declare I unto you.”—The same, I believe with Dr. Campbell, is the meaning of the term in 1 Cor. x. 20, 21; “The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice δαιμονιαις, to *dæmons*, and not to *God*.” Such by Corinthians, as by Athenians, would, I conceive, be understood as the Apostle’s meaning of the word. His representation of the case of

the heathen, so understood by them, would then precisely agree with that given in Deut. xxxii. 17, already commented on, and indeed with the Apostle's own notice of it at Athens.—Nor, as to his argument against intercommunion in respect of things offered to heathen gods, would it be rendered nugatory by this view of them as mere idol vanities; any more than in the appeal made elsewhere in the epistle, “What communion hath the temple of God with (not a *devil* but) an *idol*?” 2 Cor. vi. 16. There is certainly no *necessity* here for the sense of *devil*, so as Mr. Maitland would have it, on this ground. And indeed Dr. C.'s remark seems unanswerable;—that the heathen *could not be said* to have sacrificed to *devilish Satanic spirits*, either *abstractedly* considered, or in respect of *intention*; seeing they had not even a notion of the Devil, or Satan, of Holy Scripture.

Secondly, in the gospel narratives of our Lord's miracles while on earth, the malignant meaning strikingly and continually attaches to the word *δαίμονια*; viz. as *unclean and evil spirits*, real though *invisible*, that possessed and tormented the unhappy beings thence called *dæmoniacs*.

In regard of these remarkable cases the question has arisen wherefore these evil spirits, just during the time of our Lord's ministry and that of his Apostles, should have been permitted, as they were, so to vex the bodies of men. Nor can we doubt but that, while intended to furnish opportunity for the more signal display of Christ's power and mercy to save, it was intended also that evidence should be thereby given both of the real existence of evil spirits, of their conversancy with men, and of their *malignity* of character and influence:—evidence such as none could mistake; and that *unmasked* them, so as nothing else could have done, to the very eyes, ears, and senses of men. But besides this, and in connexion more direct with our present subject, another question arises on the case: wherefore a term hitherto chiefly applied to those imaginary figments, the gods of heathen worship, should be now so markedly applied to real living evil spirits? Nor can we well err in assigning in part the following answer; viz. that by its selection of the word *δαίμονια*, *dæmons*, to designate the actors in these possessions, the Holy Spirit would shew that, though the objects of heathen worship were mere *fictions*, there

were yet real and malignant spirits that acted in and upheld it. Thus, I say, malignant evil spirits were shown to be connected with the heathen dæmonolatry; the δαιμονια in the more awful sense of the word, with the δαιμονια in the less awful.—An example from Acts xvi well illustrates the union. A woman, it is said, had the spirit of *Apollo*, (Πυθωνος,) or of divination. Here is the phraseology of the fictions of heathenism. The Pythian *Apollo* was supposed to speak oracles through her: a heathen δαιμονιον neither imagined of, nor worshipped as, a malignant spirit:—far from it:—but rather as a being to whom attached a certain benevolence of character, and a legend of supposed victories over an evil serpent. But the miracle of the apostle evoked a real living evil spirit, a δαιμονιον in the malignant sense of the word, from the woman thought to be possessed by *Apollo*. It showed that, instead of *Apollo*, there was a πνευμα πλανης, a spirit of malignancy and lies, actually speaking in and by her.

It must be added to this explication of the New Testament use of the word that all these malignant dæmons,—spirits in numbers numberless, as the story of the Legion suffices to shew,—are represented as subordinate, for purposes of deception and evil, to that great individual Evil Spirit, the Devil, Satan. He is the Prince of the power of the air; they his αγγελιοι. (Rev. xii. 9.) Hence the meaning of the statement in Acts x. 38; “He went about healing τες καταδυναστευομενε; υπο τε Διαβολε; those that were oppressed of *the Devil*,” though it was only inferior *dæmons* that possess them: and hence too the point of the argument used by our Lord respecting his miracles on dæmoniacs; “If Satan cast out Satan,” &c. Matt. xii. 26.

Now then, such being the *twofold* Scripture use of the word δαιμονια, when applied to the objects of Gentile worship,—it being in its *direct* and *primary* meaning simply a designative of those objects, the heathen’s *gods* and *goddesses*, very much as an adoption of their own phrase, and with their own ideas of the term attached to it,—but conveying *secondarily*, and by inference from its use elsewhere, the further idea of the agency of real *malignant spirits*, not as worshipped in the system, but as suggesting, acting, and deceiving in it,—such, I say, being its scriptural use in regard of the Gentile idolatries then prevailing, the same ought evidently to be the

meaning assigned it in any prophetic description, such as that before us, of idolatrous systems at the time future. Thus it is not to be set aside as inapplicable to the *Romish canonized saints*, because the latter are not *devils*. Rather, considering the correspondency of the Romish system in its principal features with that of Greek or Roman heathenism,—considering that it is one in which the imaginary spirits of dead men are similarly worshipped, spirits supposed not seldom to be of character not very unlike the pagan demigods, and of office also similar, viz. that of guardian spirits to their worshippers, and mediators and intercessors for them with the Supreme God,—considering that it is thus a system the suggestion of living malignant spirits, as truly as heathenism, and over which they may well equally rejoice,—I say, since all this is the case, the word is evidently most appropriate in its application to them. Indeed I may confidently ask, whether there be any other word in the Greek language that would so appropriately, so comprehensively, depict both the imaginary objects, and the real suggestors of the Romish worship, as the word *δαιμονία*?—It is for objectors against our application of the word to the papal dæmonolatry to suggest another word as fit, *if they can*. If they cannot, it only remains that both they and we view the term objected to as Mede has: that is, as in itself constituting a remarkable evidence of the intended application of the Apocalyptic passage, (if not of that in 1 Tim. iv. 1 also.) to the great dæmonolatrous apostacy in Greek and Roman Christendom.

In alluding to objectors, I have had Mr. Maitland more especially in view: (see his Remarks on a Review in the *Christian Guardian*, p. 110, &c.): and I trust that, though indirectly, every objection that he makes from scripture has been in the above observations sufficiently answered. Indeed I must say that, though plausible on a first and hasty perusal, his objections appear both superficial and incorrect on examination. The distinction is not made by him between *dæmon* and *devil*, *δαιμονιον* and *ὁ διαβολος*. In his inquiry into the Scripture meaning of *δαιμονιον*, he makes no reference whatever to the *Septuagint*; though the term was thence derived into the Greek New Testament. In his mention of its use at Athens, (Acts xvii,) he omits the Apostle's *δεισιδαιμονεστεροι*, which of itself refutes his denial of the Apostle's non-employment of it, except in the sense of

devil. In his notice of the passage in 1 Cor. x., he contends that this meaning of the word can alone give sense to the passage, to which I have already shewn the contrary. Further,—while, without the least regard to the *heathen's* own appellations, ideas, or intentions, in regard of the spirits they worshipped, he will have *them* all to be *devils*,—he yet, with not very even-handed justice, yields to the spirits or beings noted for worship in the *Romish* calendar, the full benefit of the appellation that their worshippers give them : and, without inquiry into their character, will have them to be real *saints*, because they are called *saints* ; indeed to be *the* saints (fictions though they be) whose name they bear. Thus it is that at p. 115, he speaks of the *Paul* of Romish worship, as one with whom Protestant prophetic expositors would be glad to hold fellowship. But this, even as regards Mr. Maitland himself, I must beg to doubt. For the *St. Paul* of the papacy (in common with his brother *Peter*), heading as he has, with his name and with his wrath, the anti-heretical fulminations and anti-heretical crusades of the 13th and following centuries, has drunk deeper and more savagely of blood than even the heathen Moloch : and none, I am persuaded, more sincerely abominates the horrors of those wars than Mr. Maitland ; or would shrink more resolutely from fellowship with the authors of them. But even though such a change should come over him as that Mr. M. should desire fellowship with this St. Paul, the latter disclaims, and will have no fellowship with Mr. Maitland. He has already, in the Papal Bulls of excommunication against the Protestants, specially against the Protestant Clergy of England, denounced Mr. M. as a heretic, and doomed him to perdition.—No ! names are not things. The *real separate spirits* of apostles and saints are one thing ; the *ideal* sainted spirits of the Roman Calendar quite another. And if ideal impersonations of vice and wickedness as objects of worship, in the name and with the garb of Christianity, are worse than the same without it, then is the *dæmonolatry* of the Romish church, not only in other respects the close resemblance of its predecessor, but one over which evil malignant spirits must even more rejoice than they did over that of ancient heathenism.

The above, which is chiefly from *Dr. Campbell*, is sufficient to establish, on the ground of its *scriptural* use, the propriety of the application of the term *δαιμονία* to Romish canonized saints.

II. I must now advert with *Mede* to the use of δαίμονια, after the *Apostolic times*, by writers of the early Christian church. There seems to me in this something really remarkable, indeed almost providential; since to the application of the term just given it furnishes both an illustration and a confirmation well deserving of the inquirer's attention.

For 1st, it is to be observed, that up to the time when the new dæmonolatriy took place of the old, the application of the word δαίμονια to real or imaginary *spirits of dead men*, as well as to malignant spirits of hell, was understood and kept up. I give a few illustrations, in proof, from various fathers of early date. First *Ignatius*, about the middle of the second century, in his Epistle to the Smyrneans relates, that when Christ came to Peter after his resurrection, he said, Λαβετε, ψηλαψησατε με, και ιδετε οτι εκ ειμι δαίμονιον ασωματον' "See that I am not an *incorporeal demon* or *spirit*." Ignatius did not suppose, with Mr. Maitland, that *devil* was the only proper or apostolic use of the word. Again in the *Acts of the Martyrdom of Ignatius*, ch. 3, it is said, ει μη την των δαίμονιων ελοιτο λατρειαν' i. e. unless the Christian body should embrace the worship of the *heathen gods*. Next *Justin Martyr*, p. 267, uses the same phrase, δαίμονια ασωματα in the same sense; and in his Dial. cùm Tryph., pp. 309, 310, speaks of many having been induced by the Gospel καταλιπειν δαίμονια οίς εδουλευον. *Tertullian* too, in various places expresses a similar view of the word. So in his Apol. Ch. 32, after speaking of Christians not swearing by the "genios Cæsarum," he adds; "Nescitis genios *dæmonas* dici, et inde diminutivâ voce *dæmonia*?" Adding, with reference to the real evil spirits that delighted in that worship of the *dæmons* or *dead men*; "Cæterum *dæmonas*, id est genios, *adjurare* consuevimus, ut illos de hominibus exigamus, non *dejerare*:" and in Ch. 21, before noting the *dæmon* of Socrates; "Ratio illa quæ, delitescens sub nominibus et imaginibus mortuorum, quibusdam signis et miraculis et oraculis fidem Divinitatis operatur." Athenagoras in his Apolog. p. 25 (Ed. Colon.), refers to Thales' view of the δαίμονας, as εσιας ψυχικας; and Plato's, who reckoned among them Cælum, Terra, Oceanus, Saturn, Jupiter, &c. Similarly Jerom, in Hos. ii, speaking of Baal says; "Didicimus exordium *dæmonis*; imo hominis in dæmonem consecrati: omnia enim

idola ex mortuorum errore creverunt." And so elsewhere also. Finally, let me give examples from *Augustine*. In his *Civitas Dei*, written about the beginning of the fifth century, the Book viii. c. 18 is headed with, "Qualis sit religio in quâ docetur quod homines, ut commendentur Diis, *bonis dæmonibus* uti debeant advocatis;" and another chapter with, "An *dæmonibus* nuntiis et interpretibus Dii utantur." Further in a third passage we have, "Ad consequendam vitam beatam non tali mediatore indigere hominem qualis est *dæmon*, sed tali qualis est unus *Christus*." In Faust. xx. 18.—Surely when the worship of departed martyrs and saints was instealing, the familiarity of professing Christendom with this use of the word in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries was of itself well suited to awaken misgivings, lest the prophecies of the great future demonolatry, here given in Apoc. ix. 20, if not also in 1 Tim. iv. 1, might have reference to *it*.

2. But yet more, it so happened that when the church was fast verging into the worship of departed saints and martyrs, the very fathers that helped to introduce or to establish it, noted (as if by way of comment on the prophecies, as well as of warning to themselves and others) its parallelism, as more and more completed, with the heathen dæmonolatry of Greece and Rome. So, at its early beginning in the fourth century, *Eusebius*, in his *Evang. Præpar.* xiii. 11. After quoting Plato's sentiment, that he would have the *souls of men* that died valiantly in battle to be accounted for *dæmons* after death, and their sepulchres and coffins to be served and adored as the sepulchres of dæmons, he thus makes transition to the christian festivals at the tombs of *saints* and *martyrs*: Ταυτα δη αρμοζει επι τη των θεοφιλων τελευτη ες στρατιωτας της αληθους ευσεβειας εκ αν αμαρτοις ειπων παραλαμβανεσθαι· εθεν και επι τας θηκας αυτων εθος ημιν παριεναι, και τας ευχας παρα ταυταις ποιεισθαι, τιμᾶν τε τας μακαριας αυτων ψυχας. "These things do befit at (or after) the decease of the favourites of God; whom if thou shalt affirm to be taken for the champions of true religion, thou shalt not say amiss. Whence it is our custom to go unto their tombs, and to make our prayers at them, and to honour their blessed souls."—Similarly about the *close of the fourth century*, and when the worship of departed saints was more matured, *Theodoret*. Addressing the Pagan Greeks, he says; "If the Poet call good

men, after their decease, guardians and preservers of men from evil," (he had just quoted Hesiod's lines about *demons*) "and therefore the best of philosophers would have their sepulchres served and honoured, why find fault with what we do? For such as were eminent for piety, and for the sake thereof suffered death, we also call preservers and physicians. We do not call them *demons*; God forbid we should be so mad! but the *friends* and *servants of God*. . . . That the souls of holy men, even when out of the body, are in a capacity of taking care of men's affairs, Plato affirms. He bids men believe even the vulgar reports (evidencing it). But you do not only disbelieve us, but are unwilling to hearken to the loud voice of the events and effects themselves.—The martyrs' temples are frequently to be seen, famous for their beauty and greatness. They that are in health (there) pray for the continuance thereof: they that have been sick pray for recovery: the barren pray also for children:—not going to them (the *martyrs*) as Gods, but making application to them as to *divine men*, and *agents* for them *with God*, (ὡς θεοῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀντιβόλωντες, καὶ γενεσθαι πρεσβευτὰς ἕπερ σφῶν παρακαλόντες.)—Now that they who have faithful prayers have obtained their petitions, appears by the gifts brought by the votaries as acknowledgments of their recovery. Some do present (i. e. to be hung up in the churches) effigies of eyes, others of hands, and these made of gold or silver.—Nay, the martyrs have abolished and wiped out of the minds of men the memory of those who were called gods. Our Lord God hath brought his dead (the martyrs) into the place (the temples) of your gods; whom he hath sent packing, and hath given their honour to his martyrs. Instead of the feasts of Jupiter and Bacchus, are now celebrated the festivals of Peter and Paul, Thomas and Sergius, &c. and other holy martyrs. Wherefore seeing such advantages from knowing the *martyrs*, flee from the errors of *demons*; and, using the martyrs as lights and guides, follow the way which leads to God."

I quote from Mede, p. 642, who gives the original; and who to these two approvers of saint worship adds an extract in a different tone from a near cotemporary of Theodoret, Epiphanius. The latter, in rebuke of the Collyridians that offered cakes to the Virgin Mary as Queen of heaven, says; Πληρεται ἐπι τῆτες το, Ἀποσησονται τινες τῆς ἑγμειος διδασκαλίας, προσεχοντες μιθοις καὶ διδασκαλίας δαιμονιων· εσονται

γαρ, φησι, νεκροὺς λατρεύοντες, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐσεβασθησαν. “That of the Apostle is fulfilled of these ; Some shall apostatize from the sound doctrine, giving heed to fables and doctrines of dæmons ; for, saith he, they shall be worshippers of dead men, as they were worshipped in Israel.” (Ib. 636.) In which last clause there is an evident reference to Psalm cvi. 28, already quoted in this Paper ; and an actual application of that prediction in Timothy respecting a great dæmonolatrous apostacy in the church, to one branch of the dæmonolatry of the saints then begun.¹

On the whole, considering how the *scriptural* use of *δαιμονιον* has been the ground work of our argument on the word, and history both ancient and modern shewn to be illustrative and confirmatory of it, may I not in conclusion, adopt substantially Mede’s confident appeal to his readers, and say ; “ Now judge whether (not as he, *διδασκαλία δαιμονίων* 1 Tim. iv. 1,² but) *προσκυνησις δαιμονίων* in Apoc. ix. 20, hath not been fitly applied ? ”

¹ As an evidence not a little striking from modern history, of the fitness of this word *δαιμονια*, the appellative of the heathen Gods, to designate the canonized saints of the Romish calendar, I must add that at the maturity of the apostacy, just before the Reformation, (the very priests, bishops, cardinals, and popes of the Romish Church approving,) the two classes of dæmons were by painters and poets grouped together, as meet associates and participators of the same ideal heaven. See p. 52 *suprà*.

² I hesitate about this, because a genitive signifying persons after *διδασκαλία* is generally at least the genitive of the *teacher*, not the *subject*. So Ignatius ad Ephes. 17, *Διδασκαλία τῆ ἀρχόντος τῆ αἰωνοῦ τουτου*.—In Eusebius H. E. vi. 2, I observe *βδελυττομενος τας των αἵρεσεων διδασκαλιας*. But there the genitive is not one of a *person*.

II.

ON THE CHARGE OF MANICHEISM AGAINST THE EASTERN PAULIKIANS.

(See Page 288.)

WITH reference to the various charges of heresy made against the Paulikian Sectaries, I need hardly say that it is the requirement of common justice, especially in the absence of all defence or counter-testimony on the part of the Paulikians themselves, to institute a very careful comparison and examination, I might almost say cross-examination of the several accusers and accusations themselves. To facilitate this I herewith subjoin in parallel columns, and so as best to admit of comparison, a Tabular View of the charges of heresy, as they stand recorded against the Eastern and earlier Paulikians in the four principal authorities on the subject extant; viz. in *Petrus Siculus*, *Photius*, *Cedrenus*, and a certain *Formula of abjuration* (probably of the ninth century) required from Paulikians on their returning to the established church in the Greek empire:—the last-mentioned being a Formula for the republication of which from Cotelierius we are indebted to Mr. Dowling, and the value of which, especially in the question now at issue, every one will be prepared to

admit with him.¹—With regard to the *later* Paulikian sectaries in *Western Europe*, the historical abstracts given by me in the body of

¹ PETRUS SICULUS.

I. Primum illorum axioma est duo rerum esse Principia, Deum malum, et Deum bonum; aliumque hujus mundi conditorem ac principem, alium futuri ævi.—‘Age dic,’ inquit, ‘quid nos à Romanis secernit?’ (Scipios enim *Christianos* nuncupant, nos autem *Romanos*.) Et asserunt sejunctionem suam à nobis in hoc consistere, quòd ipsi quidem alium esse aiunt esse mundi conditorem, et alium quem Patrem cœlestem vocitant, exclusum à mundi administratione, solâque in æternitate dominantem.—‘Vos,’ inquit, ‘creditis in mundi opificem; nos vero in illum de quo in Evangeliiis Dominus loquitur, (Joh. 5.37.) Vocem ejus non audistis, neque speciem ejus vidistis.’

He says elsewhere; Quando in disputationis certamen descendunt, omnia Catholicorum dogmata per astum comprobant; et aiunt se Sanctissimam Trinitatem Deum profiteri, cum omnia per allegorias apud se interpretentur, et Sanctam Trinitatem inficiantes etiam detestantur. p. 754.

II. Deiparam semperque Virginem, infinitis laudibus concelebrandam, per odium abjiciunt, nulloque inter honorum hominum cœtum numero vel loco dignantur;—neque Christum ex illâ natum, ut qui corpus è cœlo secum detulerit;—Josephumque ex illâ, post Domini partum, plures liberos suscepisse dicunt.

He says elsewhere; Divinum illius partum tantum ad speciem et opinionem, non re ipsâ editum, sycophantur; et post editum hunc cœlestem partum, alios ex Josepho liberos à Virgine procreatos. 755.

Elsewhere: Incarnationem Domini Dei nostri in Virgine, quanquam alio et impio sensu, fatentur; sequiusque sentientes damnant.

PHOTIUS.

I. Duo fatentur Principia;—*alterum* Deum, cœlestem Patrem, quem et hujus rerum universitatis potestate præstantiorem asserunt; *alteri* mundi tribuunt opificium:—*illi* tantum futuri imperium ascribunt; *huic*, mundi opifici, præsentis sæculi potestatem concedunt.

He adds; Eos qui verè Christiani sunt *Romanos* appellant; sibi *Christianorum* arrogant nomen.—Also; Dicunt Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum; sed non eodem sensu quo Catholica Ecclesia. Cum enim Anathema esse dicant quicumque non credit in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum,—Patrem non pronuntiant omnipotentem, factorem cœli et terræ, visibilibus et invisibilibus: sed cum Patrem dixerint statim subjiciunt *cœlestem*; cui nullo modo cœli, et eorum quæ cœli ambitu continentur, dominatum tribuunt:—quidam tamen cœli imperium tribuunt, eorum vero quæ cœlo comprehenduntur non item.

Elsewhere he says; Dicunt ex tenebris et igne malum istud natum esse principium:—and, of the *fire*, Eum (ignem) nec principio carere nec æternum esse dicunt. p. 206.

II. In sanctissimam Dominam nostram, Dei Geneticem, maledicta conjiciunt quæ nec scribere nec audire fas est. ‘Credimus,’ inquit, ‘in sanctam Dei geneticem in quam ingressus est, et ex quâ Dominus egressus est:’ et his verbis cœlestem intelligunt Hierusalem, in quam præcursor pro nobis Christus introverit, quemadmodum etiam Apostolus ait.—Aliquando coacti confiteri ex Virgine Christum prodiisse, corpus è cœlo suscepisse dicunt, per ipsamque, tanquam per carnalem, transiisse.—Et alios etiam ex Joseph, post partum illum salutarum peperisse contendunt.

Elsewhere he says: ‘Dominus,’ inquit, ‘dixit in Evangelio, Nemo ascendit in cœlum nisi qui descendit de

my Work, chap. vii. § 4, exhibit the charges against them in quite sufficient detail : and, as the original authorities have been on nearly

FORMULA OF ANATHEMA.

I. Anathema to those who say that the Father is not the Almighty Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things in them, visible and invisible,—but only the Father of heaven, having merely authority over the world to come; inasmuch as that the present state (*αιων*), and all the world, were not made by Him, but by his Adversary the Evil One, the ruler of the world.

II. Anathema to those who insult the holy Mary, pretending to honor her:—whereas they mean instead of her the Jerusalem above, into which, they say, the Lord entered, and from which He went out.

CEDRENUS.

I. They hold the prime heresy of the Manicheans, acknowledging, as they do, the two Principles. They say, There is only one thing which separates us from the Romans; (for they call themselves *Christians*, us *Romans*;) viz. We say that the Heavenly Father is one God, and has no authority in this world, but in that which is to come; and that the Maker of the world is another, and has authority over this present.

To those who know them not they readily say, We believe one Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the Heavenly Father; and utter an Anathema against him who does not so believe. But when they say Father of heaven, they do not add, The only true God, who made heaven and earth and all things therein.

II. They immoderately blaspheme the very holy Mother of God. Whenever they are forced by us to confess her, they say allegorically, ‘I believe on the holy Mother of God, into which the Lord entered, and from which He went out.’ But they mean the Jerusalem above, into which Christ the forerunner is for us entered; and mean not in truth the holy Mary, Mother of God, nor that the Lord was incarnate of her.

every important point appended, the reader will there find on reference all the data needed for a correct judgment on their probable truth or falsehood.

PETRUS SICULUS.

In *Genæsius'* examination, a century earlier, the charge stands thus: 'Cur non colis nec adoras Deiparam sanctam?'—At ille; 'Anathema qui sanctissimam Deiparam non adorat, communem omnium nostrum matrem, in quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus introivit.' Hanc autem volebat esse supernam Hierusalem, in quam præcurrens Christus pro nobis ingressus est.

III. E sacris mysteriis divinam ac tremendam corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi conversionem negant, aliaque de hoc mysterio docent; à Domino nempe non panem et vinum in cœnâ discipulis propinatum, sed figuratè symbola tantum et verba, tanquam panem et vinum, data.

Of *Genæsius* we read thus: 'Anathema qui spernit corpus et sanguinem Jesu Christi!'—De ipsis enim verbis loquebatur. 760.

IV. Formam atque vim venerandæ et vivificæ crucis non solum non agnoscunt, sed infinitis etiam contumeliis onerant.—Of *Genæsius* it is said; 'Anathema,' inquit, 'qui non adorat et colit venerandam ac vivificam crucem:'—crucemque intelligebat Christum ipsum, manibus expansis crucem efformantem.

V. Veteris instrumenti tabulas non admittunt, nec binas Epistolas magni et immobilis ecclesiæ fundamenti, cælestis aulæ clavigeri, Petri, principis Apostolorum;—prophetasque planos et latrones appellunt.

VI. Arcent ab ecclesiæ administratione presbyteros et seniores; aiunt enim quòd seniores adversus Dominum congregati sunt.

Catholicam ecclesiam Manichæorum conciliabulum appellabat *Genæsius*.

PHOTIUS.

cælo, Filius hominis qui est in cælo: et Apostolus: Primus homo de terrâ terrenus; secundus homo Dominus de cælo. Ecce utroque in loco *cælestis* nominatur.'

III. Communionem corporis et sanguinis Christi Dei nostri contumeliis afficientes, se dicunt suscipere: cum corpus et sanguinem dicant esse verba illa Domini quæ, cum discipulis traderet, dicunt protulisse; nempe, Accipite, comedite, et bibite:—neque enim panem aut vinum adhibuisse.

Elsewhere; Nonnulli, ut simpliciores decipiant, corporis et sanguinis Domini communionem suscipiunt.

IV. Crucem, quam adorare se dicunt, afficiunt ignominia. Crucem enim fingunt esse Christum. 'Ipse,' inquit, 'manus in crucis figuram extendit.' Veram autem crucem lignum appellant, et sceleratorum instrumentum supplicii execrationibus obnoxium; et idcirco non esse adorandam nec suscipiendam.

Elsewhere; Vim (crucis) ad animæ purgationem pervenire non putant.

V. Rejiciunt Prophetas et Vetus Testamentum, et universos Sanctos qui in ipso fuerunt celebres, latrones ac fures appellantes. Imprimis autem Apostolorum principem Petrum execrantur, quòd fidem in magistrum Christum abnegavit.

VI. Consensus suos catholicam appellant ecclesiam; præsertim cum ad precandum, et ad ea quæ ad religionem pertinent inquirenda, congregantur; *προσευχας* enim suos consensus vocant.

The Tabular View thus given is appended, and is of course useful, with reference to *all* the charges of heresy made against the Paulikians; most of which have been already sifted in the body of my

FORMULA OF ANATHEMA.

CEDRENUM.

III. Anathema to those who reject the communion of the precious body and blood of Christ, feigning to receive it: whereas they mean, instead of it, the words of the doctrine of Christ, which He spoke when communicating to the apostles; Take, eat, and drink.

IV. Anathema to those who revile the venerable cross, pretending to reverence it; whereas they mean, instead of it, Christ; who, they say, with his hands extended, formed the figure of a cross.

VI. Anathema to those who reject the Catholic Church, saying that they honour it; whereas they mean, instead of it, their own conventicles and assemblies.

III. They blaspheme against the divine mysteries of the holy communion of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, saying, 'The Lord said, Take, eat, and drink! offering his words to the apostles, and not bread and wine.' And they say that bread and wine ought not to be employed.

Elsewhere he says;—Yet some coming into our orthodox church, communicate, without being detected, that they may the better deceive.

IV. They also blaspheme against the precious cross, saying that Christ is the cross, and that we ought not to worship the cross of wood, inasmuch as it is an accursed instrument.

Elsewhere he says; The sick sometimes lay it on themselves; and on recovery break or burn it.

V. They reject the Prophets and other holy men, and especially revile and express aversion from St. Peter, the great Prot-Apostle;—saying, that no one of *them* is included among them that are saved.

VI. They designate their assemblies the Catholic Church, in their allegorizing to us; calling them *Prayer-houses* (*προσευχας*) to one another.

work : nor least so with reference to one unexamined as yet, than which none has been made more strongly or universally, that of *Manicheism*. “If we are not disposed to set up our own conjectures against cotemporary testimony,”—such is the concluding clause of Mr. Dowling’s Pamphlet on the subject, “and to make antiquity bow to our prejudices, we must admit the correctness of the common opinion, and regard the Paulikians as a *Manichean* sect.”¹—It is this particular charge that has been reserved for separate examination here in the Appendix : being one involving so much of extraneous matter as would have made it in our main text rather an interruption. As a further preliminary, I subjoin too an abstract of Mosheim’s account of Manes and the Manichæan doctrine.² For the correctness of the account his

PETRUS SICULUS.

VII. Of *Genæsius* ; De baptismo affirmabat *Genæsius*, Jesum Christum ipsum esse baptisma : quòd scriptum est, Ego sum aqua vivens. p. 760.

PHOTIUS.

VII. Baptismum aspèrantur ; quod tamen se fingunt suscipere. Nam Evangelii verba baptismum existimant ; quoniam Dominus inquit, Ego sum aqua viva.

Elsewhere he says ; Liberos suos ab ecclesie presbyteris salutari baptismò volunt aliquando lustrari. Existimant enim baptismum corpori prodesse : hujus tamen vim ad animæ purgationem pervenire non putant.

¹ And so, as observed p. 233 Note 1, Mr. Maitland.

² *Manes* was a Persian educated among the Magi who worshipped the Sun. Mixing with Christians, he set forth a system corrupting Christianity, and combining Christian phrases and doctrines with the Magian. He supposed *two material Principles* of things, the element of *light* pure and subtil, of *darkness* gross and evil : each with its presiding *Ruler*,—alike sentient, independent, eternal, hostile,—one good, the other evil,—God and the Dæmon (or Hyle) ; each one the producer of many natures or beings like themselves, and with a kingdom also extended on either side in space. In a conflict of the two kingdoms, portions of the element of light were carried off by the Evil One, and mixed with the material of darkness. After this the Prince of Darkness made *man* : with a *body* formed out of the evil matter, and two *souls* : the one soul animal and sensual, infused by the Evil One ; the other rational and immortal, being a particle of the divine light previously carried off by him, and immersed in the grossest matter.

On this the good God (through the ministry of one of his agents) formed the earth out of the evil matter for man’s habitation ; his design being to rescue and extract from men’s bodies the good souls, the daughters of light, thus degraded and confined in them. With a view to help and promote his object, He formed from Himself two dignities : *Christ*, the same as the Persian Mithras, of purest light, the habitant of the sun, which Manes supposed animate : and the *Holy Spirit*, infused in etherial atmosphere, itself animate ; that enwraps and cherishes the earth, and also warms and enlightens the minds of men.—Further, in order to hasten the extrication of souls, and

well-known character for learning and candor will be of itself, to most readers, a sufficient guarantee: and he who has had the opportunity of consulting Augustine's Treatises on the subject will find in them abundant confirmation of it.

Now in every system of religion propounded to man, the points to be looked to as most important and most characteristic seem to me the following:—1st, its account of the *origin of man*, and causes of his present state and character of *mixed good and evil*;—2ndly, its statement of *the mode of his deliverance* from the evil;—3rdly, the *future prospects* opened in it beyond death, both for such as embrace the plan of deliverance, and such as reject or neglect it;—4thly, the *authority* on which these its doctrines are propounded, and

FORMULA OF ANATHEMA.

VII. Anathema to those who express a detestation of baptism, pretending to value it greatly; whereas they mean, instead of it, Christ, who they say said, I am the living water.

CEDRENUS.

VII. Baptism they consider to be the words of the Gospel; according to the saying of the Lord, I am the living water.

Elsewhere he says; some of them have their children baptized by our Presbyters.

The statements in the 1st and 2nd columns are copied from the translations of Petrus Siculus and Photius in the Bib. Pat. Max. xvi. 754, 760; xix. 204, &c:—those in the 3rd and 4th columns from Mr. Dowling's Pamphlet; pp. 36, 16.

their return to their heavenly country, He sent Christ, after other teachers, down to earth for their instruction. The human shape that he wore was but form and shadow, and his crucifixion by the Jews, the agents of the Prince of Darkness, only visionary. His mission fulfilled, he returned to the sun, his habitation: declaring however that he would send the *Paraclete*, to give them fuller instructions, and dispel all errors. This Paraclete was *Manes*: and his doctrine of life as follows:—

That the *body*, being evil, was to be weakened and mortified by the deprivation of every thing pleasant and comfortable; and the instincts, appetites, and lusts of the *sensual soul* to be also renounced and mortified:—that with this view a diet was to be adopted simply of herbs, fruits, and bread; abstinence to be practised from flesh, eggs, milk, fish, wine, or other intoxicating liquors, as also from marriage and sexual intercourse, together with a renunciation of all property, and a life passionless and without labour.—Such was the rule for the *elect* or *perfect*: out of whom alone were to be the *ministers* of the sect; viz. the twelve *Masters*, the seventy-two *Bishops*, the *Presbyters*, and the *Deacons*. And by this a *purification* of the ethereal soul was to be begun from the filth of the evil matter in this life: the which after death was to be completed by a further purification, or purgatorial process, for a fortnight in the waters of the *moon*, afterwards in the fires of the *sun*: then the *souls* to return to their original land of light; the *body* having been left to moulder for ever.—Besides these *elect*, *Manes* admitted *Auditors*, or *imperfect Christians*, also. For these he framed a less rigid rule of life, and made allowance of marriage, meats, and earthly possessions in moderation. But for them, and especially for all who might neglect

by which sanctioned.—In these four several points then let us compare the *Manichean* system and that of the *Paulikians*.¹

And the *Manichean* doctrine on them appears from Mosheim to have been as follows :

1. That an *Evil Being*, co-eternal with God and independent, was the maker of *our first parents* ; forming man's *body* out of his own evil matter, animating it with a *sensual* and *evil soul* also from himself, and using it as a kind of prison-house in which to confine certain particles of divine light forcibly stolen by him from above, which, being animate and sentient, constituted within men a *second* and *good soul* :²—further, that the *earth* was formed by *God* out of the grosser and evil matter, as an habitation for these new-created men, and an arena on which to carry on his plan for extricating the particles of Himself so imprisoned.

2. The theory above stated of man's origin and constitution doing away with all idea of *moral guilt* in men,³ and consequent judgment from God on the guilty,—it followed that the only *deliverance* sup-

the purification of the soul, a *transmigration* of the souls into *animals*, &c, was to follow death ; and some to be even given up to the daemons in the air for a temporary torture :—until, at length, the larger number of ethereal souls having been extricated, the earth was to be destroyed by fire from its inward caverns, and an eternal separation made between the original worlds of light and darkness : the souls unextricated, or lost, being ranged as guards round the world of darkness, so as to prevent egress of the evil Spirits ever after.

In order to gain credence to this his system, Manes rejected almost all the sacred Books of the Christians : affirmed the Old Testament to be the work not of God but of the Prince of Darkness : said that the Gospels were either not written by the Apostles, or had been grossly corrupted by deceitful men, interpolated, and amplified with Jewish fables. The Epistles of St. Paul he declared to have been similarly adulterated. The Acts of the Apostles he totally repudiated. And in place of the Gospels, he substituted another of his own, called *Erteng* ; dictated to him, he said, by God.—Mosheim, Sec. iii. ii. v. 2—10.

¹ See especially Augustine's De Hæres. Ch. 46, the Acts of his Dispute with Felix, and his Dissertations contra Faustum.—I may also refer to a brief notice of Manes and Manicheism in that Tract on heresies, to which I have already referred, by Timothy, Presbyter of Constantinople.

² So Augustine in his Confessions : " All this time I looked on Thee as an immense lucid body, of which I was myself the fragment."

³ So again Augustine in his Confessions. " With them (the Manichees) I considered myself perfectly sinless ; laying the blame of the evils committed on another nature that sinned within me."—See too on this Augustine's argument in his Treatise Contra duas Epistolas Pelagianas, B. ii. C. 2. (Tom. x. Col. 432 of the Benedictine Folio Edition). " Manichæi carnis concupiscentiam, non tanquam accidens vitium, sed tanquam naturam ab æternitate malam vituperant." &c.

possible was the extrication of these good souls, or animated particles of the divine substance of light, from their imprisonment. Accordingly the Manichean doctrine was that (while God had his own independent and unseen plans in action for the purpose)¹ man was required and enabled to assist :² the method of his so doing being by mortification of the body and of the sensual appetites,—by continency and refraining from marriage,—by abstinence in diet from flesh, eggs, milk, fish, wine,—as also abstinence from bodily labour, and all passions of the mind, whether of love or hatred : the result being that of macerating the evil body, mortifying the evil soul, and so loosing the bonds, and partially purging away the received pollutions, of the heavenly soul.

3. That, in the case of those who might thus help forward the purifying process, the good soul would pass immediately on death to the *moon*, and thence to the *sun*, for the completion of its *purification* in the *purgatorial* waters of the one and fires of the other, and after that to its original land of primæval light ; the body meanwhile dissolving into its elements never to rise again :—whereas the ethereal souls of others would pass at death, by *transmigration*, into animals, trees, &c ; and some even into the hands of dæmons, to be tormented : until, at length, the greater number of these souls having been extricated and restored, the earth would be destroyed by fire from its inward caverns, and the kingdoms of light and darkness remain for ever separate.

4. As to *authority* for these his doctrines, the assertion of Manes was that Christ, an emanation from God,—after having descended on earth to teach men the right way, clothed in shadowy human form, not real, and only in shadow and appearance been there too crucified,—did before re-ascending to the sun, his habitation, foretell the coming of the *Paraclete*, who should teach men all truth, and free them from all error ; and that *Manes* was this *Paraclete*.—Thus, as one invested with full power from on high, Manes framed for himself sacred books ; rejected, as spurious, the Old Testament, the Acts of the Apostles,

¹ I have already referred to passages in Augustine which relate this. The Manichean statements are too blasphemous and disgusting to transcribe.

² Augustine justly observes that, according to the Manichean doctrine, *man* was constituted the Redeemer of *God*, not *God of man*. “ Tales sunt electi (i. e. the Manichean elect) ut non sint salvandi a Deo, sed salvatores Dei ” Vol. iv. 1569.

and whatever interfered with his system in the Gospels and Epistles, declaring them to have been interpolated and corrupt; and added to what he retained of them his own *Gospel* and *other* writings, as dictated to him by God Himself.

Such was the Manichean doctrine on these four cardinal points of religion. Does then that of the Paulikians appear, on their enemies' own shewing, even to have resembled it? Let us see.

1. The first point is the doctrine of *man's origin and creator*. And here by one and all their Manicheism is asserted. "They held with Manes the *two Principles*."—But does it consist with the truth of this charge that in the earliest record of a Paulikian's examination on charge of heresy,—I allude to that of Genæsius or Timothy before the Constantinopolitan Patriarch,—there should not be even a mention of it?¹ Does it consist with the truth of the charge what Photius himself states respecting the Paulikians' tenets, that instead of professing, like the Manichees, two similarly eternal, self-existent, and independent Principles,² they represented the Evil Principle to have originated from darkness and fire,³ admitted this originating fire to have been itself not without beginning or eternal,⁴ and further

¹ Besides the less definite charges of denying the orthodox faith, and not acknowledging the catholic Church, the specific charges made against *him* will be seen from the Tabular View to have been those only of not adoring the cross,—not worshipping the Virgin Mother of God,—not partaking in, but disesteeming, the body and blood of Christ,—and also similarly derogating from baptism. This, let it be remembered, was a century after the formation of the sect; and when consequently there had been ample time to have discovered the tenet, had it existed.—Genæsius' explanations on the above points were so far deemed satisfactory that he was discharged. This was under the reign of *Leo the Isaurian*. Under a Prince of *anti-iconoclastic* principles the result might have been quite different. See Petr. Sic. p. 760.—I have just alluded to this examination of Genæsius at p. 234. See it in my Tabular View.

² ἰσοθενῆ καὶ ἀντιθετον δυαδὰ Θεοτήτος. Tim. Presb. Bib. Pat. (Paris) iv. 452.

³ "Dicunt ex tenebris et igne malum istud natum esse Principium." Photius ap. Bibl. P. Max. xix. 206.—Mosheim (Sæc. ix. ii. v. 6.) refers to this as his authority for the same statement: "Ex Photio hoc constat, docuisse eos auctorem malorum ex tenebris et igne procreatum esse:—non igitur æternus erat et originis experts."

⁴ "Cum enim ignis sensibilis existat, eum nec principio carere nec æternum esse dicent," Phot. Ibid.

Mosheim (Sæc. ix. ii. v. 6, Note a) speaks of it as evident that the Paulikians, like the Gnostics and Manichees, considered *eternal matter* to be the source of all evil; "Radicem omnis mali gens Paulicianorum, cum philosophis Orientalibus Gnosticorum et Manichæorum parentibus, in æternâ ponebat materiâ. Quod evidens est." The proof he has not given: and I am persuaded, after carefully considering Petrus Siculus's history and Photius', that it is a *total mistake*. Not only particular state-

spoke of the Heavenly Father as excelling all others in power through the universe?—As to the assertion ascribed to them that the *Evil Spirit* was the *framer of this world*, supposing it correct, it was a dogma quite different from that of Manes, who represented the *Good God* as the former of the *earth*, though not of *man*. But I care not to dwell on it; being persuaded that the real gist of the charge (and the reader needs but inspect the Tabular View to be convinced of it) turned not on the original *creation* of the world, but on its *subsequent evil constitution* and the *present spiritual ruling power* in it: and in regard of this I have elsewhere, I trust, clearly shown that they held *two principles* only as the *Bible* holds them;—*God* the author of all *good*; the *Devil*, now *dominant* in the world, of all *evil*.²

Of the sectaries in *Western Europe*, whither, as the name, so the odium and the accusations of Manicheism followed them,³ exculpation on this head seems the less needful, as the solution for the *East* may be applied to the *West*: besides which the self-contradiction and inconsistency of the accusers nullify for the most part their own accusations. Thus if the *Orleanist* Paulikians were charged with the old accusation of holding the *dualistic principle*, yet the same narrative, in its most authentic part, records them to have solemnly spo-

ments and facts, like the above from Photius, but the whole genius of the Paulikian religion is opposed to Mosheim's asserted fact.

Mr. Maitland, though with the original Latin before him, (for he quotes from it,) yet copies Maclaine's exaggerated translation of Mosheim's simple "evidens est," ("it is evident beyond all contradiction,") without observation, and in italics. Facts and Doc. p. 69. Of course this was a mere act of inadvertency. But Mr. M. has not always shown himself inclined to make allowance for similar inadvertencies on the part of others.

¹ "Alterum dicunt esse Deum, celestem Patrem, quem et hujus rerum universitatis potestate præstantiorem asserunt." B. P. M. p. 205. ² See p. 292 *suprà*.

³ The following is part of a curious profession of faith made by Gerbert on his election to the Archbishopric of Rheims, A. D. 991; and which even thus early bears allusion to Manichean heresies. "Christum passum esse verâ carnis passione, resurrexisse verâ carnis suæ resurrectione, et verâ animæ resurrectione. . . . Novi et Veteris Testamenti unum eundemque credo auctorem et Dominum et Deum. . . . Credo hujus quem gestamus, et non alterius, carnis resurrectionem. . . . Nuptias non prohibeo. . . . Carnium præceptionem non culpo. . . . In baptismo omnia peccata, id est tam illud originale contractum quàm ea quæ voluntariè admissa sunt, dimitti credo. Et extrâ ecclesiam Catholicam nullum salvari." Harduin Concil. vi. 726.—I the rather note this, as Mr. Maitland says that he has been unable to find any notice of the existence of the (supposed) Manichean heresy in Europe, before the case of the Canons at Orleans, A. D. 1022. Facts and Doc. p. 39.

ken of God so as Manichees could not ; viz. as the “*conditor omnium*,” the framer of all things.¹ Again, we find the Paulikians at *Cologne* arguing on the fact of God (not the Evil Dæmon) having joined together our first parents in marriage ;² a statement as aliene as the former from the Manichean dualistic doctrine.—But what I would here wish specially to impress on the inquirer’s mind is this ;—that to that fundamental dogma of Manes on the creation, which asserted the imprisonment of divine particles of light, or ethereal souls, by the Dæmon in human bodies, there is not so much as an allusion ; nor the shadow of any other such doctrines in association as must, I conceive, have grown out of it, had this essential Manichean doctrine been admitted ; from the very commencement of the sect to the epoch which bounds our present inquiry, full five centuries after, of Petrus Valdensis. On the contrary there appear continually and prominently, in the doctrine alike of the Eastern and Western Paulikians, ideas of *sin* and *guilt* attaching to man,—of his standing in the relation of a moral and responsible agent to God as a moral Governor,—and having in that relation fallen, so as to need God’s gracious forgiveness and pardon,—which were ideas quite opposite to the former. For example, in one of the few brief fragments of *Sergius’* letters that have been selected by Petrus Siculus with a view to his inculcation, and which have been given in full elsewhere, there is an allusion, under the Scripture figure of fornication or adultery, to our first father’s *original self-willed apostacy* from

¹ See p. 248 Note 1. Mr. Faber reasons on this as I do. To which Mr. Maitland replies thus : “ If Mr. Faber had read a little about the matter, he would have known that a Manichean might talk with perfect sectarian orthodoxy of God as the *conditor omnium* ; and he would have known how to translate that phrase better than by the “*Creator* of all things.” Letter to Mill. p. 39.—Mr. Maitland’s objurgation would have had more weight, had he *proved* that such an expression was accordant with Manicheism. In looking into Augustine, I find the very phrase *omnipotens conditor* used by *him*, in opposition to the Manichees, of God as *Creator* ; (“*ad nutum omnipotentis conditoris* :” and again ; “*Nos universam naturam ab omnipotente conditore Deo esse profitemur* :” Vol. v. col. 76, 77. Bened. Ed.) On the other hand, the *Manichean* is stated to profess a “*carnis conditorem malum* :” (Ib. x. 1314:) and consequently could not consistently have used the Orleanist expression, “*conditor omnium*,” of God.

² . . . “ quoting for this (the propriety of the marriage between two virgins) the words of our Saviour, wherewith he answers the Pharisees, ‘ What God hath joined together let no man separate ;’ as if God did only join such together as He did our first parents : as likewise those words of our Saviour, ‘ From the beginning it was not so.’” Evervinus apud Maitland, Facts and Dec. p. 318.

God, and its *transmission* from Adam to his posterity,¹ Again at *Orleans, Arras, Cologne, Oxford*, the *method of forgiveness* is a topic prominent on the face of the Paulikian doctrine.² And these are ideas and views not only different from, but, as I said, altogether repugnant to, the whole Manichean doctrine of man's original creation and constitution.³

2. As to the *mode of deliverance* of man's soul from existing evil,—not one word do we read in any of the extant records of the Eastern Paulikians, of that rule of bodily mortification and abstinence from certain foods and marriage, which was laid down by Manes as essential to that great object, and so the badge of his *elect*, including the Manichean *ministers*.⁴ On the contrary we are told both by Photius in the ninth century, and by Cedrenus in the eleventh, that the Paulikian *ministers* differed from the rest of their community neither in respect of dress, *food*, or *any other particular of common life*;⁵ and this without any intimation of the *general* and *lay* members of the sect being in these respects marked by any peculiarity. Indeed there occur incidental notices in the narratives that furnish a direct negative to the supposition of their practising any one of the Manichean rules of abstinence. Thus it is mentioned somewhere that one of their eminent ministers, I mean Joseph surnamed Epaphroditus, was (like the prophet Amos)⁶ a *goat-herd*,⁷ and the *milking* of the goats a part of the routine of managing them, with him as with others:⁸ whereas *milk* was an article of *food* by the Manichees

¹ "Prima fornicatio quam ex Adamo ducimus," &c. Petr. Sic. p. 763. See my p. 271.—How could he write this, had he believed that evil originated in eternal matter?

² See the historical sketches which precede in my chapter vii. § 4.

³ See Augustine contra Julian. Lib. vi. (Bened. Ed. x. 1311, &c.) "Ea," i. e. the evils of life, "Manichæi tribuunt alienæ naturæ male; Catholici vere et bonæ et nostræ, sed peccato vitiatæ meritoque puniæ."

⁴ See the sketch of Manicheism abstracted from Mosheim, p. 447 supra.

⁵ "Atque hi" (i. e. the Paulikian priests) "nec habitu, nec victu, nec ullâ alia ratione vivendi modum graviorem ostendunt quo à populo distinguantur." Photius ubi sup. p. 205. His accusation of the sectaries generally, "Vita eorum plena est intemperantiæ," shows that with them there was no rule of abstinence in *food*.—Mr. Dowling quotes Cedrenus respecting the Paulikian priesthood to the same effect as Photius. p. 19.

⁶ Amos vii. 14; "I was no prophet, but a herdsman."

⁷ "Erat huic," i. e. to the Paulikian minister Genesisius or Timothy, "puer caprarius;" afterwards called Joseph and Epaphroditus; and who succeeded Timothy in the ministry. Petr. Sic. p. 761.

⁸ "Josephi currus convertit; dicens Sarracenis se ad barbariam opus et armata proficisci." Ibid.

utterly proscribed as polluted. Again, the *children* of the sectaries (in one case of Paul, the most eminent living member, if not *minister* of the sect) are noticed in connection with their parents, as a circumstance quite of course and not calling for particular remark :¹ also, in contrast with the rest, some that were born out of wedlock ; the latter, as well as the *adulteress* mothers, with a certain opprobrium attaching to them in consequence :²—all alike indicating *marriage* to have been recognized among them, and common. Further we read of their *abounding in labors*, instead of cultivating that *inertness* which Petrus himself, in his introductory sketch, notices like others as a characteristic of the real Manichees :³ and of their exhibiting an energy of mind and feeling, the very contrary to that *listlessness* and *impassiveness of spirit* which on the elect of the Manicheans, just as on the monkish devotees of the Egyptian and Syrian churches of the fourth and fifth centuries, was enjoined as another act of discipline ;—it being in fact supposed a further help to the emancipation of the imprisoned soul. Thus let it be well noted by the Reader that against the Paulikians of the East there exists not even the *charge* of following *in a single point* the Manichean ascetic discipline.—And what then of the branches of the sect in *Western Europe* ? Is it credible that they should all suddenly have adopted it on their migration ? No doubt the charges were now at length made frequently enough against them : but still, as on the *dualistic* point, almost always self-contradictorily. Thus if it be related by John of Fleury, in his

¹ So of the parents sometimes bringing their children to the Greek priests for baptism, &c. Photius, p. 205.—Paul, called by Mr. Dowling, (p. 13) “the reviver of the sect,” after the martyrdom of Simcon, was the *father* of Genæsius ; whom, under the name of Timothy, he dedicated to the ministry.

² Thus of *Joseph*: “Puer *cuprarius* quem prope viam olim forte offenderat, (sc. Timotheus) fasciis involutum, quòd ex injusto scilicet pollutoque thoro natus esset : solet enim adultera fetus suos, criminis metu, in viam projicere.” Petr. Sic. *ibid.*—Timothy’s seclusion with his followers in Mananalis from the rest of his countrymen renders it probable that this was an adulteress of their own body, who thus strove to hide her shame. At any rate Petrus does not say whether she belonged to the one body or the other ; thus shewing that the fact might have been true of the Paulikians, as well as of the Greeks of the Church Catholic. To *Baanes*, as illegitimate, names of stigma seem also to have attached ; “*sordidus* Baanes,—*spurius* Baanes,” “*ex scortis* nasci, &c.” *Ib.*

³ “*Inertie mancipia* Manichæi, qui cessant ipsi, et sudantium fruges absumunt.” *Ib.* 758. It is really curious to contrast his account of the *real* Manicheans with that of the Paulikians which follows. So little does the one agree with the other.

epistolary fragment, against those at *Orleans*, that they disparaged marriage, and abstained from meats and fat which God had created, as from impurities,¹ we find that in this charge he stands alone: and, in particular, that Arefaste's own account (as we may call that in the Chartulary, when separated from the monkish legends interwoven) says nothing of it. Besides which, the very circumstance of the persons accused being *Canons* of the Church is of itself almost a guarantee against the truth of that part of it respecting *meats*. For it was a rule of the order of *Canons* to eat at a common table; ² and if any new rule of diet had been adopted by them, it must needs, ere the lapse of at least three years,³ have excited observation and inquiry in the fraternity.—Again at *Arras*, if the charge was made against the dissentients there examined, not indeed of abstaining from *meats*, but of *execrating legitimate marriage*, yet on comparing this on the one hand with the recorded statement respecting their brethren at *Cologne* that some had their *wives* with them,⁴ and on the other with the form of the charge when made against the sectaries shortly after at *Oxford*, as disparaging marriage in its character of one of the *sacramental* remedies for the moral disease of human nature,⁵ we may reasonably infer two things as to the accusation made at *Arras*:—1st, that there was no actual disallowance of marriage among them: 2nd, that the objection made to marriage was made to it only in its asserted character of a *sacrament*,⁶ and as solemnized in the *Romish Churches*, by *Romish Priests*, and with *Romish superstitious ceremonies*,⁷—for such only were then deemed *legitimate*;⁸—objections savouring of Protestantism rather than of Mani-

¹ See p. 243 *suprà*.

² See Mosheim, *Sæc.* viii. ii. ii. 14; who there notes the origin in the 8th century of the order of *canons*, “sacerdotum genus inter *monachos* (sive *regulares*) et *sæculares sacerdotes* medium:” adding; “qui quidem monachorum disciplinam et vitæ formam ex parte æmulabantur; id est *communi domo et mensâ* utebantur.”

³ See p. 246, 247.

⁴ See p. 260.

⁵ See p. 265.

⁶ The Council of Trent declares that the Fathers, Councils, and Tradition of the Universal Church have made marriage a *sacrament*.

⁷ Thus a little after the time of which I am speaking, viz. A. D. 1204, in the Constitutions of the Archbishop of Paris, it was decreed that before the solemnization of marriage the parties must *confess* to the Priest. Harduin *Concil.* vi. ii. 1979.

⁸ In the Decretal Epistle of Pope Calixtus I, Pope from 213 A. D. to 223,—a Decretal Epistle now admitted to be spurious, but which had force through the middle ages,—the person that married without the *Priest's benediction* (“qui absque bene-

cheism.—It is not in fact till the case at *Cologne*, A.D. 1147, that there appears any at all credible report of Paulikian sectaries practising rules of abstinence. And then (I allude to the charge respecting *meats*) it is distinctively related of but *one* out of *two* branches of them, in contrast with the other; ¹ it being perhaps all the while (such I strongly suspect to have been the fact) the ascetism of *other separatists*, intermixed among the former, of *quite a different character and origin*.

3. With regard to the *prospects held out beyond death*, the difference is marked still as strongly as before. Not one word do we find in any of the existing records of the Paulikians, throughout the long period of 500 years now past in review, either of *purgatory*, or *transmigration of souls*, or a final *consummation* such as that set forth by Manes and the Manichees. On the contrary we read in the Paulikian woman's characteristic conversation with Sergius, (of which see the extract below.) ² a faithful scriptural statement of Christ's (*dictione sacerdotis constat copulatus*) is classed with the infamous and the incestuous. Hard. i. 111.

Let me add, of later times, that in a Council of Cambray, held A. D. 1586, it is ordered, with a view to the following up of the Decrees of the Council of Trent, that in countries occupied by heretics, and in which the Decrees of that Council had been published, the *marriages contracted* should be *ipso facto null and void*: and that whichever of the parties so married might return to the Catholic Church, they should be at liberty, even during the life of the other, to contract a new and legitimate marriage. Hard. ix. 2163.

¹ See p. 259, 260.

² After the commencement of the conversation, given literally p. 234, 235,—she proceeds to question Sergius on the meaning and application of that text, (For look, she said, and see whether it is not so written,) "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, have we not in thy name cast out demons, and done many virtues? and the King (rex) answering will say, I know you not."—On Sergius's hesitation, she added; "With us the explanation is obvious. There are those even now who profess Christianity, and have the reputation of living piously, that make use of certain charms for expelling demons, and curing diseases; just like the sons of Sceva spoken of in the Acts of the Apostles as exorcists. These are they to whom the Lord will say in that day, I never knew you. To others too that fall into error He will say, Thou hadst in this life what was thine; now depart: and who will thus fail of the kingdom of heaven."—Again she quoted the passage, 'Many shall come from the East, and from the West, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom will be cast into outer darkness.' And "who are these *children of the kingdom*?" she said. Most stupid man, observes Petrus Siculus of Sergius, that he did not know it was simply of the *Jews* that Christ spoke. But the woman applied it more home. "It is your holy ones," she said; "they who expel demons, &c, and whom ye venerate as if they were deities,—the living and immortal Lord being left by you. It is they to whom the words apply. 'I never knew you.'" Petri Sic. p. 762 Petrus seems to suppose

judgment at the last day,—of the separation at that time between the false professing Christians and the true,—and the exclusion of the one, and the admission of the other, into the *kingdom of Heaven*. And this heavenly *Kingdom to come* is marked to us, in what is elsewhere recorded of them, as the great object of their future anticipations; that of which it was their consolation to believe themselves chosen members in this its *initiatory* state on earth, out of the mass of professing but apostate Christians, (“We are *Christians*, ye *Romans* ;”¹) and for Christ’s establishment of which, according to the Paulikian woman’s quotations from Scripture, they looked at the last day. It is in the *world to come*, they said, that the good God (Christ) is to have authority :² and then too, with a reverence and affection that excited the jealousy of the Virgin-worshippers, spoke of the *Jerusalem above*, the Mother of us all, as that from whence Christ the forerunner, having for us entered it, would surely come again.³—In Western Europe, as before observed, among the very superstitions protested against by the sectaries, we find that, which was alike *Manichean* and *Romish*, of *purgatory*. So at Arras and at Cologne, by the Petrobrussians, and by those of Oxford.⁴ The then prevalence of *that error* called out their sentiments on the state of the soul *immediately after death*; which was this, that it entered

departed saints to have been meant by the woman in the last passage. But it seems clear to me that it was the reputed holy ones then living; i. e. their *priests*: respecting whom, as we have seen (p. 243) Mahomet charged the Greek Christians of the 7th century thus; “They take their priests and monks for their lords, besides God.”

¹ See the Tabular View, p. 442, 3. The affixing of the appellation of *Romans* to the apostates of the Church established, in contradistinction to that of *Christians*, seems to me to indicate a reference to the Apocalyptic prediction; where the kingdom of the *Great City on the seven hills*, or *Rome*, is spoken of as that opposed to the *City of God*.

² Compare Christ’s appellation of *πατηρ της μελλοντος αιωνος*.

³ “From which He went out,” is the version of the anti-Paulikian writers: in which case the Paulikians must be supposed to have referred to the heavenly City, as one begun to be formed and prepared by Christ for his people *before his incarnation*; a view not unaccordant with Scripture. But I presume the more exact version to be that which I have here given.—It may be interesting to compare the petition, “Thy kingdom come,” in the Lord’s Prayer, what is said of the *world to come* in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and what in that to the Galatians, and in the Apocalypse, of the *Heavenly Jerusalem*, with these Paulikian anticipations.

⁴ In *Ralph of Coggeshal’s* notice of the Oxford heretics, he speaks of them, in common with others, as of a sect which protested against *purgatory*.

forthwith into a state of rest or punishment. Thus Evervinus quotes their argument to this effect from the Old Testament Scripture; "Where the tree falleth there it lieth."¹ A similar report is made by Eckbert.² And the reader will not have forgotten the Orleanists' expectation of *speedy* joy on their condemnation to the stake: "Even now we see our King reigning in the heavenly places; who with his right hand is conducting us to immortal triumphs and heavenly joys."³—Of course this doctrine did not interfere, any more than it now does among ourselves, with that just before ascribed to their Eastern Brethren respecting the great consummation, and Christ's establishment in the *age to come* of his heavenly kingdom. "Blessed," said the condemned ones at Oxford, "are those that are persecuted for righteousness sake; for theirs is the *kingdom of Heaven*." In either view they were alike un-Manichean.

4. We have to compare the Paulikian sect with the Manichees in respect of the *sacred books* or *writings* by it received, as of divine authority. But what indeed the need of further statement on this head? We have already seen that, instead of receiving Manes' writings, the Eastern Paulikians in the strongest terms disowned belief in, and anathematized them; in this ever acting precisely according to the injunction and example of their founder Constantine: further that the only authority they admitted on religious doctrine was the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament:⁴ their copies of the New Testament being indeed at first incomplete, just as put into Constantine's hand by the Syrian Deacon; but, as all allow,⁵ with the text pure and unadulterated.—Again in the sectaries of Western Europe, we have marked the same implicit and exclusive

¹ See above p. 261.

² "Concerning the souls of the dead, they hold that at the time of their death, they pass either to everlasting blessedness or to eternal damnation. For they do not receive what the Universal Church believes, viz. that there are certain purgatorial punishments, in which some of the souls of the elect are for a time tried for their sins, from which they are not fully purified in this life by due satisfaction." Facts and Doc. 354.

³ See p. 247.

⁴ See p. 231.—Petrus Siculus in stating the Paulikians' rejection of Manes and Manes' disciples, uses the strong terms, "Scythianum, et Buddam, et Maactem ipsum, promptis animis *respuunt et detestantur*."

⁵ To Petrus Siculus' and Cedrenus' testimony before given add that of Photius, B. P. M. ubi suprâ p. 204.

deference to the inspired Scriptures. The contrast on this point between the Paulikians and the Manichees is direct and total.

On the whole, I think the reader will by this time agree with me, not only in most fully exculpating the Paulikians from the charge of *Manicheism*, but in wondering how such a charge could have been ever made against them; and, yet more, how, after having been made, it could have been maintained and generally believed in, as it has, even to the present time.—The facts seem to be as follows. True religion has ever had its names of opprobrium. At the rise of Paulikianism, and afterwards, *Manichee* was the opprobrious term most in vogue. The *Eutylian* and *Monophysite* were reviled as Manichees; ¹ the *Iconoclast* as a Manichee.² What else then the *Paulikian* dissident? The charge once originated, the bigotry of the apostate churches in Greek and Roman Christendom pretty much insured its continuance. So at least through the middle ages. As to its general credence since the revival of literature, not only by writers of the Romish Church, but by Protestants of learning and candor, we may account in a measure, in so far as the *Eastern* Paulikians are concerned, from that slow and partial development on which Mr. Dowling has well observed,³ of the literary records concerning them. Further, of the Paulikians of the *West*, antecedent to the time of Petrus Valdensis, the character has greatly suffered from the subsequent rise or notoriety of fanatical sects holding doctrines not unlike some of the Manicheans, which are asserted to have been offshoots of Paulikianism. Of these there are extant records, more or less full, and more or less credible, written by Ermengardus A.D. 1200, Peter of Vaux Sernai A.D. 1218,

¹ Gibbon vii. 57. Hard. ii. 1333.

² See Dowling, p. 50, &c.—In latter times Pope Boniface the 8th even condemned as *Manichees* all that asserted the prerogative of Kings, as independent of and not subject to the *Pope*.

³ p. 10. "I cannot help observing how slowly and gradually the evidence has come to light. The *Centuriators* derived all they knew from *Zonaras* and the *Continuator* of *Paulus Diaconus*: &c." Now how could the *Centuriators* have formed a correct judgment simply from *Zonaras*, on the character of the Paulikian sect? It was their honor to be the first effectively to direct the inquiries of Protestants to the existence of Witnesses for Christ in preceding ages. The full unfolding of the Witnesses was to be the gradual work of the three centuries following.—It was not till 1604 that the Tract of *Petrus Siculus* was published, though *Baronius* had previously made use of it.

Reinerius Saccho A.D. 1254, and, above all, in the Codex Tolosanus, or Record of the examinations and sentences of heretics by the Inquisition at Toulouse, from A.D. 1307 to 1323.¹ And though it needs of course that great deductions be made from the statements of chroniclers and officials so bigotted, and sometimes so absurd,² yet, after every allowance, it must be admitted that the evidence is sufficient to fix on these sectaries the character of fanaticism and heresy. Which being so, the odium of their heresy has been reflected back on those before them; by Mosheim indeed on none more early than the Albigenses and Cathari of the *close* of the twelfth century;³ but by Maitland, so as to include the earlier Paulikians of Lombers, Oxford, Cologne, &c., as far back at least as the year 1119.⁴—But to what extent is the retrospective inference to be carried? Is it just or reasonable, even supposing these fanatics to have sprung out of them, to involve those earlier Paulikians in the same condemnation, on whom cotemporary authentic history affixes no such stigma? As well might we argue that Calvin and his Genevese Church were Socinians, from the Socinianism of their modern successors; or Luther a Neologist, because of the neology of more modern Lutherans. What do we find in the records of the heretics at Lombers, Cologne, Oxford, Arras, or Orleans of the *endura*,⁵ or *convenenza*,⁶ or senseless *bowings* and *adorations of the minister*, which, as Mr. Maitland justly observes,⁷ are the things most prominent in the religion, if it may be so called, of the heretics of the Tolosan Codex?—The truth deducible from historic evidence seems, as before intimated, to have been this; that from about the time of Evervinus, A.D. 1147, there was observable a diversity and division among the sectaries *reputed* of Paulikian origin;⁸ though I more and more think

¹ All given in Mr. Maitland's Facts and Documents.

² In this way Peter of Vaux Sernai has specially distinguished himself.

³ See Sæc. xi. ii. v. 2, with the appended Note; also Sæc. xiii. ii. v. 7, with Note L. Mr. Hallam, if I remember right, has done the same.

⁴ See Facts and Doc. p. 90, &c.

⁵ i. e. "A *fasting themselves*," as Limborch says, "to death."

⁶ An *agreement* that near the end of life they would be received as *perfect* members into the sect.

⁷ Facts and Doc. p. 452.

⁸ "One might expect," says Mr. M. "that they (the Albigenses examined) would have recollected some exhortations, for instance, against lying and stealing, some admonitions not to do or speak evil, not to do to others what they would not that others should do to them;—but nothing is I believe to be found." Ib. p. 453. Contrast this with the Paulikian statement of morals at Arras.

that others were even then intermixed, just like the Gnostics among the early Christians, of quite a different original; one of the most obvious points of difference being the adoption by some of a rule of abstinence and asceticism, which the others did not follow :—that, as time went on, the differences became wider and more diversified; the ascetics deviating at length into the fanaticism that was unfolded in its matured absurdities before the inquisition of Toulouse :—but that, on the other hand, a pure stream of doctrine and morals was all along continued by the *real* Paulikians; until these last commingled at length, though informally and only from the natural effect of similarity of sentiment, with the followers of Petrus Valdensis. This is a solution which will account for the facts of the case, and I believe the only one.—As to the charge of *Manicheism*, made against these pre-Valdensian Paulikians, both in the East and West, and made by such a list of writers as Mr. Dowling specifies, it appears to me, (as I must here beg to repeat,) if considered in a mere *literary* point of view, to be nothing less than one of the most extraordinary mistakes in the history of Literature.

III.

LA NOBLA LEYCZON.

TEXT FROM THE GENEVAN M.S., AS IT IS PRINTED IN RAYNOUAD'S
CHOIX DES POÉSIES DES TROUBADOURS, VOL. II. pp. 73—103.

- 1 O frayres, entende una nobla leyczon :
Sovent deven velhar e istar en oreson,
Car nos veyen aquest mont esser pres del chavon ;
Mot curios deorian esser de bonas obras far,
5 Car nos veyen aquest mont de la fin apropiariar.
Ben ha mil e cent ancز compli entierament
Que fo scripta l'ora car sen al derier temp ;
Poc deorian cubitar, car sen al remanent.
Tot jorn veyen las ensegnas venir a compliment,
10 Acreisament de mal e amerment de ben.
Ayczon son li perilh que l'escriptura di :
L'Evangelic o reconta, e Sant Paul asi
Que neun home que viva non po saber sa fin ;
Per czo deven mais temer, car nos non sen certan
15 Si la mort nos penre o encuey o deman ;
Ma cant venre Yeshu al dia del jujament,
Un chascun recebre per entier pajament,
E aquilh que auren fait mal e que auren fait ben.
Ma l'escriptura di, e nos creire o deven,
20 Que tuit home del mont per dui chaminz tenren :
Li bon iren en gloria e li mal al torment.
Ma aquel que non creire en aquel departiment,

- Regarde l'escriptura del fin commencement,
 Depois que Adam fo forma entro al temps present ;
 25 Aqui poire trobar, si el aure entendament,
 Que poc son li salva, a ver lo remanent.
 Ma chascuna persona, l'alcal vol ben obrar,
 Lo nom de dio lo paire deo esser al commenczar,
 * E apellar en ajuda lo seo glorios filh car,
 30 Filh de Sancta Maria,
 E lo sant Spirit, que nos done bona via.
 Aquisti trey, la sancta trinita, }
 Enayma un dio devon esser aura }
 Plen de tota sapientia e de tota poisenca e de tota bonta.
 35 Aquest deven sovent aurar e requerir
 Que nos done fortalecza encontra l'enemic,
 Que nos lo poisan vencer devant la nostra fin,
 Co es lo mont e lo diavol e la carn,
 E nos done sapienca acompagna de bonta,
 40 Que nos poisan conoisser la via de verita,
 E gardar pura l'arma que dios nos ha dona,
 L'arma e lo cors en via de carita,
 Enayma que nos aman la santa trinita
 E lo proyme, car dio ho ha comanda.
 45 Non sol aquel que nos fay ben, mas aquel que nos fay mal,
 E aver ferma speranca al rey celestial
 Que a la fin nos alberge al seo glorios hostel :
 Ma aquel que non fare czo que se conten en aquesta leiczon
 Non intrare en la sancta maison.
 50 Ma czo es de greo tenir a la cativa gent
 Lical aman trop l'or e l'argent,
 E han las empromissions de dio en despreziament,
 E que no gardan la ley e li comandament
 Ni la laissan gardar a alcuna bona gent,
 55 Ma, segont lor poer, hi fan empachament.
 E per que es aguest mal entre humana gent ?

* Champoglion suggests that the line and the measure run thus:—

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
 E ap el ar en ai da lo seo glorios filh car

- Per czo que Adam peche del fin comencament,
 Car el manje del pom otra deffendament
 E a li autre germene lo gran del mal semenez ;
 60 El aquiste a si mort e a l'autre enseguador,
 Ben poen dire que aqui ac mal bocon.
 Ma Xrist a reemps li bon per la soa passion,
 Ma enpereo nos troben en aquesta leyczon
 Que Adam fo mescrezent a dio lo seo creator :
 65 De ayci poen ver que ara son fait peior,
 Ce il habandonan dio lo paire omnipotent,
 E creon a las ydolas al lor destruiment,
 Co que deffent la ley que fo del comencament.
 Ley de natura s'apella, comuna a tota gent,
 70 Lacal dio pause al cor del seo primier forma ;
 De poer far mal o ben li done franqueta ;
 Lo mal li a deffendu, lo ben li a comanda :
 Aiczo poes vos ben veer qu'es ista mal garda.
 Que aven laisa lo ben, e lo mal aven obra,
 75 Enayma fey Caym, lo primier filh de Adam,
 Que aucis son frayre Abel senezca alcuna rason,
 Ma car el era bon
 E avia sa fe al segnor e non a creatura ;
 Ayci poen penre exemple de la ley de natura
 80 Lacal haven coropta, passa haven la mesura ;
 Pecca aven al creator e offendu a la creatura.
 Nobla ley era aquela lacal dio nos done,
 Al cor d'un chascun home scripta la pause,
 Que el leges e gardes e enseignes dreitura.
 85 Ames dio al seo cor sobre tota creatura,
 E temes e serves, non hi pauses mesura,
 Ce non es atroba en la santa scriptura ;
 Gardes ferm lo matrimoni, aquel noble convent ;
 Agues pacz au li fraire e ames tota outra gent,
 90 Ayres arguelh e ames humilita,
 E fes a li autre enayma volria esser fait a si ;
 E, si el fes per lo contrari, qu'el en fossa puni.
 Paue foron aquilh que la ley ben garderon,
 E moti foron aquilh que la trespasieron ;

- 95 E lo segnor habandoneron, non donant a li honor,
 Ma creseron al demoni e a la soa temptation :
 Trop ameron lo mont, e poc lo paradis,
 E serviron al cors maiorment que a l'esprit ;
 Emperczo nos troben que moti en son peri.
- 100 Ayci se po repenre tot home que di ;
 Que dio non fe las gencz per laisser li perir
 Ma garde se un chascun que non entrevega enayma a lor,
 Ce lei dulivi venc e destruis li fellon.
 Ma dio fey far archa en lacal el enclaus li bon ;
- 105 Tant fo creisu lo mal e lo ben amerma
 Que en tot lo mont non ac mas que oyt salva :
 Grant exemple poen penre en aquesta sentença
 Que nos nos gardan de mal e faczan penedencza.
 Ce Yeshu Xrist ha dit, e en san Luc es script,
- 110 Que tuit aquilh que no la faren periren tuit ;
 Ma aquilh que scamperon, dio lor fey empromession
 Que jamais en aiga non perera lo mont.
 Aquilh creisseron e foron multiplica ;
 Del ben que dio lor fey poc foron recorda,
- 115 Ma agron tan poc de fe e tant grant la temor,
 Qu'illi non creseron ben al dit de lor segnor,
 Ma temian que las aygas nehesan encar lo mont
 E disseron de far torre per reduce se aqui,
 E ben la comenczero segont czo qu'es script,
- 120 E dician de far la-larga e tan hauta e tant grant
 Qu'ilh pervengues entro al cel, ma non pogron far tant,
 C'ela desplaç a dio, e lor en fey semblant.
 Babelonia avia nom aquella grant cipta.
 E ara es dicta confusio per la soa malvesta.
- 125 Adonca era un lengage entre tota la gent,
 Ma qu'ilh non s'entendesan dio fey departiment.
 Qu'il non fessan la torre qu'ilh avian comenza.
 Li language foron per tot lo mont scampa.
 Poi pecheron greoment, habandonant la ley, co es lev de natura,
- 130 Enayma se po provar per la santa scriptura ;
 Que cinc ciptas periron lascal fasian lo mal ;
 En fuoc e en solpre dio li condampne ;

- El destruis li fellon, e li bon deslivre
 Co fo Loth e aquilh de son hostel que l'angel en gitte ;
 135 Quatre foron per nombre, ma l'un se condampne,
 Co fo la molie, pur car se reguarde otra defendement.
 Aysi ha grant exemple a tota humana gent
 Qu'ilh se dean gardar do czo qui dio deffent.
 En aquel temp fo Abram, baron placzent a dio,
 140 E engentre un patriarcha dont foron li Judio ;
 Nobla gent foron aquilh en la temor de dio,
 En Egips habiteron entre outra mala gent ;
 Lay foron apermu e costreit per lonc temp,
 E crideron al segnor, e el lor trames Moysent,
 145 E delivre son poble e destruis l'autra gent :
 Per lo mar ros passeron, com per bel eysuyt ;
 Ma li enemie de lor, lical li perseguian, hi periron tuit.
 Motas outras ensegnas dio al seo poble fey ;
 El li pac quaranta an el desert, e lor done la ley ;
 150 En doas taulas peyrientes la trames per Moysent :
 E troberon la y scripta e ordena noblament.
 Un segnor demonstra esser a tota gent,
 E aquel deguessan creyre e amar de tot lo cor,
 E temer e servir entro al dia de la fin ;
 155 E un chascun ames lo proyme enayma si,
 Conselhesan las vevas, e li orfe sostenir,
 Alberguesan li paure, e li nu revestir,
 Paguesan li fameiant e li errant endreycesan,
 E la ley de lui mot fort deguessan gardar ;
 160 E a li gardant promes lo regne celestial.
 Lo serviment de las ydolas lor mes en defension,
 Homecidi, avoteri e tota fornigacion,
 Mentir e perjurar e falsa garentia,
 Usura e rapina e mala cubiticia,
 165 Enamps avaricia e tota fellonia ;
 A li bon enpromes vita, e li mal aucia.
 Adonca era justicia en la soa segnorla,
 Car aquilh que trapassavan ni faczian malament
 Erau mort e destruit senczr perdonament :
 170 Ma l'escrptura di, e mot es manifest

- Que trenta milia foron li remas al desert ;
Trenta milia e plus, segont que di la ley,
Ilh foron mort de glay, de fuoc e de serpent ;
E moti autre periron del destermenament,
- 175 La terra se partic, e li receop l'enfern.
Ayci nos nos poen repenre del nostre grant soport
Ma aquilh que feron ben lo placzer del segnor
Hereteron la terra de l'enpromession.
Mot fo de nobla gent en aquela faczon,
- 180 Enayma fo David e lo rey Salamon,
Ysaia, Jeremia e moti autre baron,
Lical combatian per la ley e faczian deffension,
Un poble era a dio eyleit de tot lo mont :
Li enemie qui li perseguian eran moti d'entron ;
- 185 Grant exemple poen penre en aquesta leyczon :
Cant ilh gardavan la ley e li comandament,
Dio combatia per lor encontra l'autra gent ;
Ma cant ilh peccavan ni faczian malament,
Ilh eran mort e destruit e pres de l'autra gent.
- 190 Tant fo alarga lo poble e plen de gran ricor
Qu'el vay traire li caucz encontra son segnor :
Emperczo nos troben en aquesta leyczon
Que lo rei de Babelonia li mes en sa preyson ;
Lai foron apernu e constreit per lonc temp,
- 195 E crideron al segnor au lo cor repentent :
Adonca li retorne en Jerusalem ;
Pauc foron li obedient que gardesan la ley
Ni aguessan la temor d'offender lo lor rey :
Ma hi ac alcuna gent plen de si grant falsita ;
- 200 Co foron li Pharisio e li autre scriptura ;
Qu'ilh gardesan la ley mot era de mostra,
Que la gent o veguessan, per esser plus honra ;
Ma poc val aquel honor que tost ven a chavon :
Ilh perseguian li sant e li just e li bon ;
- 205 Au plor e au gemament oravan lo segnor
Qu'el deisendes en terra per salvar aquest mont,
Car tot l'uman lignage anava a predicion.
Adonca dio trames l'angel a una nobla donczella de lignage
de rey ;

- Noblament la saluda, car s'apartenia a ley ;
- 210 Enamps li dis : “ Non temer, Maria,
 “ Car lo sant sperit es en ta companhia ;
 “ De tu nayssere filh que apellares Yeshu ;
 “ El salvare son poble de czo qu'el ha offendu.”
 Noo mes lo porte al seo ventre la vergena gloriosa,
- 215 Ma qu'ilh no fos represa, de Joseph fo sposa :
 Paura era Nostra Dona e Joseph atresi ;
 Ma ayczó deven creire, car l'evangeli ho di,
 Que en la crepia lo pauseron, cant fo na lo fantin,
 De pan l'enveloperon, paurement fo alberga :
- 220 Ayci se pon repener li cubit e li avar
 Que de amassar aur non se volon cessar :
 Moti miracle foron, cant fo na lo segnor,
 Car dio trames l'angel anunciar a li pastor,
 Et en Orient aparec una stella a li trey baron ;
- 225 Gloria fo dona a dio al cel, e en terra pacz a li bon ;
 Ma enamps un petit sufferc persecution ;
 Ma lo fantin creisia per gracia e per eta
 E en sapiencia divina en l'acal el era enseгна ;
 E apelle doze apostol lical son ben nomna,
- 230 E vole mudar la ley que devant avia dona ;
 El non la mude pas, qu'ilh fos habandona,
 Ma la renouvelle, qu'ilh fos malh garda.
 El receop lo baptisme per donar salvament,
 E dis a li apostol que baptegesan la gent ;
- 235 Car adonca comenczava lo renovellament.
 Ben deffent la ley velha fornigar e avoutrar,
 Ma la novella repren veser e cubitar :
 La ley velha autreia partir lo matrimoni,
 E carta de refu se deguessa donar ;
- 240 Ma a novella di non penre la leysa,
 E neun non departa co que dio a ajosta :
 La ley velha maudi lo ventre que fruc non a porta,
 Ma la novella conselha gardar vergeneta :
 La ley velha deffent solament perjurar,
- 245 Ma la novella di al pos tot non jurar,
 E plus de si o de no non sia en ton parllar :

- La ley velha comanda combater li enemis e render mal per mal ;
 Ma la novelha di : “ Non te volhas venjar,
 “ Ma laisa la venjanca al rey celestial,
 250 E laisa viore en pacz aquilh que te faren mal,
 “ E trobares perdon del rey celestial.”
 La ley velha di : “ Ama li tio amic, e aures en odi li enemis.”
 Ma la novella di : “ Non fares plus en aisi,
 “ Ma ama li vostre enemis e facze ben ha aquilh lical ayzeron vos
 255 “ E aura per li perseguent e per li acaisonant vos.”
 La ley velha comanda punir li mal faczent ;
 Ma la novella di : “ Perdona a tota gent ;
 “ E trobares perdon del paire omnipotent ;
 “ Car si tu non perdonas, non aures salvament.”
 260 Neun non deo aucir ni irar neuna gent ;
 Manc ni simple ni paure non deven scarnir,
 Ni tenir vil l'estrang que ven d'autrui pais,
 Car en aquest mont nos sen tuit pelegrin ;
 Ma car nos sen tuit fraire, deven tuit dio servir.
 265 Co es la ley novella que Yesbu Xrist a dit que nos deven tenir.
 E apelle li seo apostol, e fe a lor comandament
 Que annesan per lo mont, et ensegnesan la gent,
 Judios e Grec prediquesan e tota humana gent ;
 E done a lor posta desobre li serpent,
 270 Gittesan li demoni e sanesan li enferm,
 Rexucitesan li mort e mondesan li lebros,
 E fesan a li autre enayma el avia fait a lor ;
 D'or ni d'argent non fossan possesent,
 Ma au vita e vistimenta se tenguesan content ;
 275 Amesan se entre lor e aguesan bona pacz :
 Adonca lor enpromes lo regne celestial,
 E aquilh que tenren poverta spiritual ;
 Ma qui sabria cals son, ilh serian tost numbra,
 Que volhan esser paure per propria volunta.
 280 De czo que era a venir el lor vay annunciar,
 Cossi el devia morir e pois rexucitar,
 E lor dis las ensegnas e li demonstrament
 Lical devian venir devant lo feniment ;
 Motas bellas semblanzas dis a lor e a la gent

- 285 Lascals foron scriptas al novel testament.
 Mas, si Xrist volen amar e segre sa doctrina,
 Nos convent a velhar, e legir l'escritura.
 Aqui poyren trobar, cant nos auren legi,
 Que solament per far ben Xrist fo persegu ;
- 290 El rexucitava li mort per divina vertu,
 E faczia veser li cec que unca non havian vist ;
 El mundava li lebros e li sort faczia auvir,
 E gittava li demoni, faczent totas vertuez ;
 E cant el faczia mais de ben, plus era persegu :
- 295 Co eran li Pharisio lical lo perseguian
 E aquilh del rey Herode e l'autra gent clergia ;
 Car ilh avian envidia car la gent lo seguia :
 E car la gent creyan en li e en li seo commandament,
 Penseron lui aucire e far lo trayment,
- 300 E parlleron a Juda, e feron con li convenent
 Que, si el lo lor liores, el agra trenta argent,
 E Juda fo cubit e fey lo tradiment,
 E liore son segnor entre la mala gent.
 Li Judio foron aquilh que lo crucifiqueron ;
- 305 Li pe e las mas forment li clavelleron,
 E corona de spinas en la testa li pauseron ;
 Diczent li moti repropri, ilh lo blastemeron :
 El dis que avia se, fel e aci li abeoreron.
 Tan foron li torment amar e doloyros
- 310 Que l'arma partic del cors per salvar li peccador.
 Lo cors remas aqui pendu sus en la crocz
 Al mecz de dui layron.
 Quatre plagas li feron, senza li autre batament,
 Poys li feron la cinquena, per far lo compliment ;
- 315 Car un de li cavalier vent e li ubere la costa :
 Adonca ysic sanc e ayga ensemmp mescla.
 Tuit li apostol fugiron, ma un hi retorne,
 E era aqui au las Marias istant josta la crocz.
 Gran dolor avian tuit, ma Nostra Dona maior
- 320 Cant ilh vey a son filh mort, nu, en afan sus la crocz.
 De li bon fo scbeli, e garda de li fellon ;
 El trays li seo d'enfern e rexucite al terez jorn,

- E aparec a li seo, enayma el avia dit a lor.
Adonca agron grant goy, cant vigron lo segnor.
- 325 E foron conforta, car devant avian grant paor,
E converse cum lor entro al dia de l'ascension.
Adonca monte en gloria lo nostre salvador,
E dis a li seo apostol e a li autre ensegnador
Que entro a la fin del mont fora tota via au lor.
- 330 Mas cant venc a Pendecosta, se recorde de lor,
E lor trames lo sant Sperit local es consolador ;
E ensegne li apostol per divina doctrina,
E saupron li lengage e la santa scriptura.
Adonca lor sovenc de czo qu'el avia dit,
- 335 Sencza temor parlavan la doctrina de Xrist ;
Judios e Grec predicavan, faczent motas virtuez,
E li crescent baptejavan al nom de Yeshu Xrist.
Adonca fo fait un poble de novel converti :
Cristians foron nomna, car ilh creyan en Xrist.
- 340 Ma czo troben que l'escriptura di,
Mot for li perseguian Judios e Saragins ;
Ma tant foron fort li apostol en la temor del segnor,
E li home e las fennas lical eran cum lor,
Que per lor non laisavan ni lor fait ni lor dit,
- 345 Tant que moti n'auciseron enayma ilh avian Yeshu Xrist :
Grant foron li torment segont czo qu'es script,
Solament car ilh demostravan la via de Yeshu Xrist ;
Ma lical li perseguian non lor era de tant mal temor,
Car ilh non avian la fe de nostre segnor Yeshu Xrist,
- 350 Coma d'aquilh que queron ara caison e que perseguon tant,
Que Xrestian devon esser, ma mal en fan semblant,
Ma en czo sepon reprener aquilh quepersegon,e confortarli bon ;
Car non se troba en scriptura santa ni per raezon
Que li sant perseguesan alcun ni mesesan e preson ;
- 355 Ma enamps li apostol foron alcun doctor
Lical mostravan la via de Xrist lo nostre salvador.
Ma encar s'en troba alcun al temp present,
Lical son manifest a mot poc de la gent,
La via de Yeshu Xrist mot fort volrian mostrar,
- 360 Ma tant son persequi que a pena o poyon far :

- Tan son li fals Xriatisn enceca per error,
 E maiorment que li autre aquilh que Devon esser pastor,
 Que ilh perseguon e aucion aquilh que son melhor,
 E laysan en pancz li fals e li enganador !
- 365 Ma en czo se po conoyser qu'ilh non son bon pastor,
 Car non aman las feas sinon per la toyson ;
 Ma l'escriptura di, e nos o poen ver,
 Que si n'i a alcun bon que ame e tema Yeshu Xrist,
 Que non volha maudire ni jurar ni mentir,
- 370 Ni avoutrar ni aucir ni penre de l'autruy,
 Ni venjar se de li seo enemis,
 Ilh dion qu'es Vaudes e degne de punir,
 E li troban cayson en meczonja e engan.
 Cosi ilh poirian toller czo qu'el ha de son just afan :
- 375 Ma forment se conforte aquel que suffre per l'onor del segnor ;
 Car lo regne del cel li sere aparelha al partir d'aquest mont :
 Adonca aure grant gloria, si el ha agu desonor ;
 Ma en czo es manifesta la malvesta de lor,
 Que qui vol maudir e mentir e jurar,
- 380 E prestar a usura e aucir e avoutrar,
 E venjar se d'aquilh que li fan mal,
 Ilh diczon qu'el es prodome, e leal home reconta ;
 Ma a la fin se garde qu'el non sia enganna :
 Cant lo mal lo costreng tant que a pena po parlar,
- 385 El demanda lo prever e se vol confessar ;
 Ma, segont l'escriptura, el ha trop tarceza, lacal di :
 " San e vio te confessa e non attendre a la fin." *
 Lo prever li demanda si el ha negun pecca ;
 Duy mot o Trey respont e tost ha despacha.
- 390 Ben li di lo prever que el non po esser asot,
 Si el non rent tot l'autruy e smenda li seo tort.
 Ma cant el au ayezo, el ha grant pensament,
 E pensa entre si que, si el rent entierament,
 Que remanra a li seo enfant, e que dire la gent ;
- 395 E comanda a li seo enfant que smendon li seo tort,
 E fay pat au lo prever qu'il poisa esser asot :
 Si el a cent liuras de l'autruy o encara dui cent,
 Lo prever lo quitta per cent sout o encara per menz,

- E li fai amonestançza e li promet pardon ;
 400 Qu'el faca dire mesa per si e per li sio payron,
 E lor empromet pardon sia a just, o sia a fellon :
 Adonca li pausa la man sobre la testa ;
 Cant el li dona mais, li fai plus grant festa,
 E li fai entendament que el es mot ben asot :
 405 Ma mal son smenda aquilh de qui el ha agu li tort.
 Ma el sere enganna en aital asolvament ;
 E aquel que ho fay encreyre hi pecca mortalment.
 Ma yo aus o dire, car se troba en ver,
 Que tuit li papa que foron de Silvestre entro en aquest,
 410 E tuit li cardinal e tuit li vesque e tuit li aba,
 Tuit aquisti ensem non han tan de potesta
 Que ilh poissan perdonar un sol pecca mortal :
 Solament dio perdona, que autre non ho po far.
 Ma acyzo devon far aquilh que son pastor :
 415 Predicar devon lo poble e istar en oracion,
 E paizer li sovent de divina doctrina,
 E castigar li peccant, donant a lor disciplina,
 Co es vraya amonestançza qu'ilh ayan pentiment ;
 Purament se confesson sençza alcun mançament,
 420 E qu'ilh faczan penitencia, en la vita present,
 De junar, far almonas e aurar au cor bulhent ;
 Car per aquestas cosas troba l'arma salvament
 De nos caytio crestians lical haven pecca ;
 La ley de Yeshu Xrist haven habandonna,
 425 Car non haven temor ni fe ni carita :
 Repentir nos convent e non y deven tarezar ;
 Au plor e au pentiment nos conven smendar
 L'offensa que haven fayta per trey pecca mortal,
 Per cubitia d'olh, e per deleyt de carn,
 430 E per superbia de vita per que nos haven fait li mal ;
 Car per aquesta via nos deven segre e tenir.
 Se nos volen amar ni segre Yeshu Xrist,
 Paureta spiritual de cor deven tenir.
 E amar castita, e dio humilment servir ;
 435 Adonca segrian la via del segnor Yeshu Xrist.
 E aurian la victoria de li nostre enemies.

- Breoment es reconta en aquesta leyczon
 De las tres leys que dio done al mont.
 La primera ley demostra a qui ha sen ni raczon,
- 440 Co es a conoiser dio e honrar lo seo creator ,
 Car aquel que ha entendament po pensar entre si
 Qu'el no s'es pas forma ni li autre atresi :
 D'ayci po conoiser aquel que ha sen ni raczon
 Che lo es un segnor dio local a forma lo mont ;
- 445 E, reconoisent lui, mot lo deven honrar,
 Car aquilh foron dampna que non ho volgron far.
 Ma la segunda ley, que dio done a Moysent,
 Nos enseña a tenir dio e servir luy fortment,
 Car el condampna e punis tot home que l'offent.
- 450 Ma la tercza ley, lacal es ara al temp present,
 Nos enseña amar dio de bon cor e servir purament ;
 Car dio atent lo peccador e li dona alongament
 Qu'el poysa far penitencia en la vita present.
 Autre ley d'ayci enant non deven plus aver,
- 455 Sinon en segre Yeshu Xrist, e far lo seo bon placer,
 E gardar fermament czo qu'el a comanda,
 E esser mot avisa cant venre l'Antexrist,
 Que nos non crean ni a son fait ni a son dit ;
 Car, segont l'escriptura, son ara fait moti Antexrist :
- 460 Car Antexrist son tuit aquilh que contrastan a Xrist.
 Motas enseñas e grant demonstrament
 Seren dos aquest temp entro al dia del jujament ;
 Lo cel e la terra ardren, e murren tuit li vivent,
 Poys rexucitaren tuit en vita permanent,
- 465 E seren aplana tuit li hedificament.
 Adonca sere fayt lo derier jujament :
 Dio partire lo seo poble, segont czo qu'es script ;
 A li mal el dire : “ Departe vos de mi,
 “ Ana al fuoc enferral que mays non aura fin ;
- 470 “ Per trey greos condicions sere constreit aqui,
 “ Per moutecaza de penas, e per aspre torment,
 “ E car sere dampna sencaza defalhiment.”
 Del cal nos garde dio per lo seo placzament,
 E nos done auvir czo qu'el dire a li seo enant que sia gaire,

475 Diczent : “ Vene vos en au mi, beneit del mio payre,
“ A possesir loregne aperelha a vos del comencament del mont,
“ Al cal vos aure deleit, riquezas e honors.”
Placza ha aquel segnor, que forme tot lo mont,
Que nos siam de li esleit per istar en sa cort !
Djo gracias. Amen.

THE END OF VOL. II.

BS2825 .E46 v.2
Horae Apocalypticae; or, A commentary on

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00069 3574

