

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

A REVIEW

OF

FOX THE MARTYROLOGIST'S

HISTORY OF THE

WALDENSES.

BY THE REV. S. R. MAITLAND.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR J. G. AND F. RIVINGTON:
AND T. JEW, GLOUCESTER;
BY L. BRYANT; AND SOLD BY
STRONG, BRISTOL AND EXETER; AND MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

1837.

MM 10-18-2005

Ms. 3-8 missing.

REVIEW, &c.

THOSE who are endeavouring to understand the history of the Waldenses, must have appreciated the papers which appeared in the appendix to the *Christian Observer* for the year 1835, and in the numbers for the following February and July, under the signature of Arnaud de Bonneville, or A. D. B.; and those who were really interested in the subject, and anxious that truth should prevail, must have been grieved that the editor should not only have declined making his Magazine the channel for the publication of such valuable matter, but that he should have represented to his readers that he was, out of compassion to them, going to “break off this minute discussion respecting early Waldensian dates.” *July*, p. 407. The discussion was about no such thing. In fact, the Waldensian controversy (considering how many dates of an obscure period do come into it) is remarkably free from such discussions; for even when it happens that there is a difference of statement—as for instance, whether Waldo began preaching in 1160, 1170, or 1180—it is seldom that any writer has pretended that it is of the least consequence which is right. Many of the dates it may be impossible to settle; but it is almost as impossible to make their uncertainty affect the argument. The real matter in dispute is

vastly different. The question is, what was the real origin, life, and doctrine, of a sect which has been represented by many writers as the true Church of Christ, to the almost entire exclusion of all other people on earth—as the apocalyptic witnesses—as those from whom we of the Church of England should joyfully reckon our descent—as our protestant forefathers—in short, the question is anything but one of minute chronology; it respects the facts of history, and the knowledge and fidelity of historians, who have obtained a degree of authority which renders the question very important.

In the remarks, however, with which he dismissed what he thus misrepresented, the Editor brought forward an authority who has not been, I believe, very often cited in this controversy. He says “we certainly do not wish A. D. B. to accept of Fox as an original authority any more than Thuanus (though Fox was Thuanus’s senior by thirty-six years, having been born in 1517), but he *could not* in *honesty* have attested that Waldo’s ‘doings’ were then extant in ‘old parchment monuments’, if he *had not proof of the fact.*” He tells us that “Fox, in a *laborious examination* of testimony, when the facts were comparatively recent, and ‘parchment monuments’ were still he says in existence, comes to the conclusion that Waldo was fully competent to translate the word of God into his vernacular tongue, and that he did so”—that a certain confession, to which Fox makes no allusion, “*could not* have *escaped his scrutiny* if it was in existence”—he calls for an examination of the martyrologists’ statements, and boldly asks “Does Fox falsify, or unfairly abridge, or partially select documents?”

This challenge I feel bound to accept; for after attempting to turn the controversy into a channel which seemed to me more likely to lead to truth, by referring, and confining, it to the “original authorities,” from which alone modern writers

can pretend to know anything about the matter, I begin to think that the only way is, specifically to meet new and popular statements, in the hope that as they are exposed and refuted, people may begin to creep back to original sources, and so come at truth—that readers may see how they are hoaxed by ignorant pretenders, and that even some of the pretenders themselves may become ashamed of the nonsense which they have been led to write, by relying on modern authorities, which have misled them. I am fully aware that this is a wearisome, and ungracious task; for it is one of the contrivances of ignorance to shelter itself behind popular names, because if it turns out that what has been recklessly asserted cannot be maintained, it may, instead of retracting, throw odium upon its opponents, and raise an Ephesian uproar against the blasphemers of its idol. Such clamour it is easy to despise; but in this case, I may hope that it will not be raised; for nobody can deny that if Fox's character for fidelity or knowledge, should suffer from this review of his history of the Waldenses, it is not my fault. I am not going out of my way to attack him; but answering a plain question put by the editor of the *Christian Observer* in a controversy, in which my name and my statements on the subject have been repeatedly mentioned. I feel called upon to take some notice of the question; and I hope to enable the reader to judge, not only of the answer which should be given to it, but of the qualification of the writer who asked it, and of the propriety of his interfering in the controversy.

I should have done this before, but that just at the same time that this paper appeared, I saw the prospectus of a new edition of Fox; the one being in the *Christian Observer* for July, 1836, and the other stitched up in another magazine for the same month. "It will be their object," say the publishers, "in pursuit of which no pains or expense will be spared, to render this edition the most perfect that has yet

appeared. The various editions will be collated; the latest corrections of the author introduced; while the errors which have crept into the copies published after his decease will be removed. They are happy to be able to state that they are enabled to calculate on the most important assistance in the facilities offered by Public Libraries, and also in the access given to the best copies of the work which are known to be extant in the hands of private individuals." They afterwards say that "the general superintendance of the work, and its accurate and faithful performance," will be undertaken by the editor "with the aid of able and experienced assistants."

After such an announcement, it seemed to me that it would be premature, and almost unfair, to publish anything relating to Fox's work, until I should see the new edition, and learn how far the errors of the old ones, to which I had access, (those of 1596 and 1684) were corrected. It is now published; and a letter has appeared in the Record newspaper for the 16th of January, signed by the Rev. Josiah Pratt, the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, and the Rev. Charles Bridges, in which they say, "We have the best evidence that the publishers were guided by no selfish motives in undertaking the work, and that they have spared no pains or expense in securing the most able assistance for the prosecution of it." I do not know what evidence these gentlemen refer to; but certainly it is not internal evidence. The volume itself testifies, indeed, the taste and liberality of the publishers and the skill of the printer; but without some external evidence, indeed without some evidence directly opposed to that which is furnished by the volume itself, it would be difficult to believe that where neither pains nor expense were spared, more able assistance in the editorial department might not have been obtained. Here, however, it is of more immediate importance to notice what these gentlemen say of the work

itself, than of the new edition of it. They state that they feel it an "exercise of Christian responsibility to call the public attention to it" for five reasons; one of which is, "the high character of the work for *accuracy of detail*." Will they give me credit for a similar motive when I say, that if Fox's work has any such character (which I really did not know that it had) it is, as relates to all that I have examined, quite undeserved? Will they believe my assurance that I feel it a matter of duty, especially now that they have given their sanction to the character which they state that Fox has obtained for 'accuracy of detail,' to take up the Editor of the Christian Observer's question, and to shew that the attempt to set up Fox as an authority—not indeed, as he humourously observes, as an "*original authority*," but as an authority of any kind—is perfectly absurd?

To come then at once to Fox's History of the Waldenses—or rather to begin with three paragraphs by which he introduces it, and from which we may more clearly ascertain the source from which he derived it, and the manner in which he compiled it:

"In the time of this Alexander sprang up the doctrine and name of those, who were then called 'pauperes de Lugduno,' who, from one Waldus, a chief senator in Lyons, were named 'Waldenses;' also 'Leonistæ' and 'Insabbatati:' about A.D. 1109, or, as Laziardus writeth, 1170."

On this it may be sufficient to remark that the 6 appears to have jumped over the 0, and alighted on his head. No one, I think, can doubt from what follows that Fox originally wrote, or meant to write, 1160. But it stands so in the editions of 1596, 1684; and, for any thing that I know, in all others.

The next paragraph is little more than a translation of that with which Mathias Flacius Illyricus, as he called himself (or plainly Matthew Francowitz), began the article "Valdenses" at p. 704 of his 'Catalogus Testium Veritatis;' which was printed in the year 1556, three years before the

publication of Fox's first edition. How much Fox was indebted to this writer, whose name he does not mention, and to whose work he gives no reference whatever, throughout his whole history of the Waldenses, will be seen as we proceed. In order that it may appear more clearly, I shall give Fox's text as it stands in the new edition, and that of Illyricus from the edition of 1556, in parallel columns:—

Not long before this time, as is expressed above, rose up Gratian, master of the decrees, and Peter the Lombard, master of the sentences, both archpillars of all papistry; after whom followed also two as evil, or worse than they, Francis and Dominic, maintaining blind hypocrisy, no less than the other maintained proud pre-lacy. As these laboured one way, by superstition and worldly advancement, to corrupt the sincerity of religion, so it pleased Christ, the contrary way, labouring against these, to raise up therefore the said Waldenses against the pride and hypocrisy of the others. *p.* 263.

Videor mihi animadvertere, et Deum et satanam sub idem tempus, eadem consilia instaurandi confirmandi; suum cœtum et religionem agitasse. Nam ante quadringentos annos, et Satan quatuor quosdam apostolos, veluti quatuor suæ impietatis columnas excitavit, qui suum Antichristum ejus que abominationes egregie confirmarunt, stabilierunt que: et Christus suam religionem Antichristi abominationibus mundatam, mundo denuo exhibuit, ac ostendit. Quatuor illi Satanae apostoli, qui ante 400 annos papatum egregie confirmarunt, ac veluti a fundamentis instaurarunt, fuerunt: primum Gratianus Decreti collector, et Petrus Lombardus, qui Magister sententiarum vulgo a sophistis vocatur: quorum uterq; partim ex sacris literis, partim et multo magis ex patrib. ac conciliis mala fide collectis, peioriq; interpretatis ac detorti sententiis, papisticam religionem probare, stabilireq; sunt conati. Deinde Franciscus et Dominicus, qui instituta nova hypoerisi monachatus, homines etiam quam quisquam ante, superstitionibus præsumperunt dementare. Porro Christus potissimum per quemdam Petrum Vualdum Lugduni primarium civem, suam veritatem, depulsis Antichristi tenebris (ut postea clarius apparebit) illustravit. *p.* 704.

The next paragraph is as follows:—

“Thus we never see any great corruption in the church, but that some sparkle of the true and clear light of the gospel yet by God's providence doth remain; whatsoever the Doctors Augustinus, Reinerius, Sylvius, and Cranzius, with others in their popish histories, do write of them, defaming them through mis-report, and accusing them to magistrates as disobedient to orders, rebels to the catholic church, and contemners of the Virgin Mary, yet they who carry judgment indifferent, rather trusting truth than wavering with the times, in

weighing their articles, shall find it otherwise, and that they maintained nothing else but the same doctrine which is now defended in the church. And yet I suppose not contrary, but as the papists did with the articles of Wickliff and Huss, so they did in like manner with their articles also, in gathering and wresting them otherwise than they were meant."

The only observation which it is necessary to make on this paragraph—but it is one most important as it regards the character of Fox for knowledge and fidelity—is that in thus introducing his history of the Waldenses, he distinctly states, that "they maintained NOTHING ELSE but the SAME DOCTRINE which is NOW defended in the Church." Let this be borne in mind while we examine the history itself;—

The history of the Waldenses, concerning their original and doctrine, with their persecutions.

The first original of these Waldenses, came of one Waldus, a man both of great substance, and no less calling in the city of Lyons, the occasion whereof is declared of divers writers thus to come.

About A.D. 1160, it chanced that divers of the best and chiefest heads of the city of Lyons, talking and walking in a certain place after their old accustomed manner, especially in the summer-time, conferred and consulted together upon matters, either to pass over time, or to debate things to be done; amongst whom it chanced for one (the rest looking on) to fall down by sudden death. In the number of these this aforesaid Waldus, there being amongst them, was one; who, beholding the matter more earnestly than the others, and terrified with so heavy an example, being, as it is said, a rich man, and God's Holy Spirit working withal, was stricken with a deep and inward repentance, whereupon followed a new alteration, with a careful study to reform his former life; insomuch that he began first to minister large alms of his goods to such as needed; secondly, to instruct himself and his family in the true knowledge of God's word: thirdly, to admonish all that resorted to him on any occasion, to repentance and virtuous amendment of life.

Illyricus.

Accidit autem ea doctrinæ religionisq; Christianæ instauratio, ut multi historici testantur, hoc modo :

Circa Annum Domini 1160, fuerunt Lugduni aliquot optimates, quodam loco congregati, conferentes de variis rebus: ut solent sæpe, præsertim æstatis tẽpore, in Italia et Gallia in porticibus magnates convenire dispellendi tædii causa, ac colloquendi cum aliis sui ordinis viris. Ibi dum illi ociosi sermones cedunt, accidit, ut subito unus spectantibus omnibus aliis mortuus corrueret. Eo tam triste exemplo fragilitatis humanæ divinæq; iræ perterritus ac commotus unus ex illis nomine Vualdus, homo prædives, hand dubie impellente eum etiam Dei spiritu, cœpit cogitare de pœnitentia agenda, ac vera pietate aliquanto magis serio colenda, quam ante fecerat. Cœpit igitur et eleemosynas largius distribuere, et se suamq; domum, ac eos qui eum aliquando quacunq; occasione accedebant, docere et admonere de pœnitentia ac vera pietate.

Thus, partly through his large giving to the poor, and partly through his diligent teaching and wholesome admonitions, more resort of people daily frequented about him; whom when he did see ready and diligent to learn, he began to give out to them certain rudiments of the Scripture, which he had translated himself into the French tongue, for as he was a man wealthy in riches, so he was also not unlearned.

Although Laziardus Volateranus, with others, note him utterly unlearned, and charge him with ignorance, as who should procure others to write and translate for him; by others, who have seen his doings yet remaining in old parchment monuments, it appeareth he was both able to declare and to translate the books of Scripture, and also did collect the doctors' mind upon the same.

Progrediente paulatim tum beneficentia ejus in egenos tum ipsius studio docendi, aliorumq; discendi, jam etiam frequentior cœtus ad eum ventitare cœpit: et ipse eis non suas aliquas regulas, suiq; capitis somnia dictare, sed sacras literas tum explicando declarare, tum in vulgarem Gallicam linguam transferre.

Fuit enim homo doctus, ut ex vetustis membranis cognosco: et non curavit sibi ab aliis verti, ut quidam veritatis inimici mentiuntur. p. 706.

I scarcely need say that this is mere translation from Illyricus. This is evident from a mere glance at the two; but I apprehend that it further appears from a circumstance which ought to be noticed. The Editor of the Christian Observer says, "in his first volume (p. 260), he had given, from 'divers writers,' 1160 as the date of Waldo's remarkable conversion," &c., *July, p. 407*. Now it is obvious that Fox's "divers writers," is a mere translation of Illyricus's "multi historici;" and though I do not pretend to say that there may not be "divers writers" who relate the story as Illyricus does, yet I must say that I do not remember to have met with them, and I believe that the story, as told by Illyricus, was made entirely from the plain statement of Reinerius that, "when the principal citizens of Lyons were together, it occurred that one died suddenly in the presence of the others, whereby one of them was so alarmed that he immediately distributed a large property to the poor."*

* "Cum cives majores pariter essent in Lugduno contingit quendam ex eis mori subito coram eis. Unde quidam inter eos tantum fuit territus, quod statim magnum thesaurum pauperibus erogavit."

As to the "old parchment monuments"—the editor of the *Christian Observer* says that Fox "could not in *honesty* have attested that Waldo's doings were then extant in 'old parchment monuments,' if he had not proof of the fact; and as the passage happened to fall under our hands while we were writing, we noticed it as a grain in the balance of evidence respecting what Mr. Maitland justly calls 'one of the best authenticated facts' in Waldo's history—namely, his translating the scriptures—of course not the whole, but portions of them." *July*, p. 407. This, as every one who turns to the passage which the editor quotes may see, is a misrepresentation of my statement on the very point here in question. I said "if these 'ancient Vallenses' had this confession [of 1120, which speaks of reading the scriptures and even the apocrypha to the people] cut and dry, at least forty years, before he began his Christian labours, why, in all the world, did that good man trouble himself to make a translation of the Scriptures? Yet, that he did this, is perhaps, one of the best authenticated facts of his history."* Had these words stood alone, there might have been some ground for representing me as contending that Waldo himself translated the scriptures; but, in fact, I went on to state what I meant by Waldo's troubling "himself to make a translation," by adducing the testimony of Stephen of Bourbon. That writer, who died in 1261, tells us that the very thing which set Waldo on the translation of the Gospels which he used to hear, was that he did not himself understand them—that he therefore engaged a priest named Stephanus de Ansa, or Emsa, to translate them into the vulgar tongue—that this Stephen de Emsa did so translate them, and dictated them to one Bernardus Ydros, who was then a young man, and was hired as a scribe on the occasion, but afterwards came to

* Facts and Doc. p. 127.

be considerably respected (*satis honoratus*) in Lyons—and that he himself (Stephen of Bourbon, who tells the story) had often seen Stephen de Emsa the translator, had the story from Bernard Ydros the scribe, and had heard the account of the origin of the sect from many persons who had seen the earlier members of it. On this ground I say that Waldo's troubling himself to make a translation of the Scriptures, is one of the best authenticated facts of his history; but certainly I never meant to convey the idea that he did himself make it, but immediately went on to say what I have here stated, and what is, I think, most convincing evidence that Waldo did not, and could not, do it; and that the attempt to set him up as a learned man, is a mere matter of sectarian nonsense. What the Editor means by a "balance of evidence" I do not know; nor can I guess where he can look for any evidence of Waldo's ability to translate which can weigh for a moment against the plain and pointed testimony of Stephen of Bourbon.

But what will the Editor do about Fox's honesty, which he has so rashly staked? Will he deny that he was copying Illyricus? It seems quite impossible? Will he maintain that Illyricus meant us to understand (as Fox evidently did) that he had seen Waldo's 'doings' in old parchments? Surely not—for at p. 722, he laments that no ancient writings, not merely of Waldo, but of the sect, were in existence—a very awkward declaration for those who undertake to maintain the Noble Lesson, and the Confession of 1120, and all the Bibliotheca Morlandiana; but so it is—"Valde mirum ac dolendum est *nullum* paulo vetustius eorum scriptum extare."

I may add that the sentence respecting Laziardus and Volateranus (who, for want of a comma, look like one person in the new edition,) is, as far as I know, Fox's own, and he is speaking of two modern writers whose works I suppose that he had really seen. At least I see nothing of them in that

part of Illyricus which Fox continues to follow :—

But whatsoever he was, lettered or unlettered, the bishops and prelates seeing him so to intermeddle with the Scriptures, and to have such resort about him, albeit it was but in his own house, under private conference, could neither abide that the Scriptures should be declared by any other, nor would they take the pains to declare them themselves. So, being moved with great malice against the man, they threatened to excommunicate him if he did not leave off so to do. Waldus, seeing his doing to be but godly, and their malice stirred up upon no just nor godly cause, neglecting the threatenings and frettings of the wicked, said, that ‘ God must be obeyed more than man.’

To be brief, the more diligent he was in setting forth the true doctrine of Christ against the errors of Antichrist, the more maliciously their fierceness increased; insomuch that when they did see their excommunication to be despised, and would not serve, they ceased not with prison, with sword, and with banishment, to persecute, till at length they had driven both Waldus, and all the favourers of his true preaching, out of the city.

Episcopus porro et prælati, qui, ut Christus inquit, claves regni cælorum abstulerunt, ac nec ipsi intrare nec alios intrmittere volunt, ægre ferentes hominem laicum et secularem (ut isti spiritualis clericatusq; nomine gloriantes, tumentesq; alios Christianos præ se contemnunt) sacras literas in vulgarem sermonem vertere, docendo declarare, et jam etiam quasi cætus quosdam domi suæ habere, eiq; concionari: primum monuerunt eum, ejusq; sectatores, ut ab instituto desisterent: addita etiam excommunicationis comminatione. Verum nec ipsius studium promovendæ gloriæ Dei, salutisq; proximi: nec fames verbi Dei, qua pusilli Christi nemine alioqui in templis verbum Dei syncere docente, laborabant, talibus pharissæorum et pontificum mandatis cohiberi poterat. Dicebat enim et doctor et auditores, Deo magis quam hominibus obediendum esse.....

..... Cermentes itaq; Episcopus ac ejus pharisei et scribæ, Valdi ejusq; sectatorum in docendo ac discendo Dei verbo constantiam, quam illi pertinaciam esse calumniabantur: dolentes etiam suas turpitudines, inscitiam, negligentiam in docendo, et aliquos etiam errores ab eis taxari, excommunicaverunt eos omnes simul. Aliquanto vere post, cum illos ne excommunicatione quidem moveri cernerent, ut a suo proposito desisterent, etiam exilio, carceribus, ferro demum ac igni persequi, et crudeliter vexare cœperunt: ut necessitate, præsentiq; periculo coacti sint Lugduno discedere, ac in varias terras diffugere et dilabi.

Fox proceeds :—

Hereupon came first their name, that they were called ‘ Waldenses,’ or ‘ Pauperes de Lugduno,’ not because they would have all things common amongst them, or that they, professing any wilful poverty, would imitate to live as the apostles did, as Sylvius did falsely belie them, but because they, being thrust out both of country and goods, were compelled to live poorly, whether they would or no. And thus much touching the first occasion and beginning of these men, and of the restoring and maintaining of the true doctrine of Christ’s gospel, against the proud proceedings of popish errors. Now concerning their articles, which I find in order and in number to be these :—

Before I make any other remark on this passage I must, for two reasons, give the two paragraphs of Illyricus, which immediately follow what I have just quoted from him. First, because one of them contains the original of Fox's statement respecting their name; and secondly, because they are both so characteristic of the writer whom Fox appears to have followed, as blindly as the Editor of the *Christain Observer* has followed Fox. It is quite clear that Illyricus was making up a story of what he considered, or chose to set forth, as probabilities 'Credibile est'—'verisimile est'—'procul dubio,' are forms of speech in which he delights.

"Credibile est aliquot annis, forte quatuor aut quinque, eum cœtum durasse, ac Valdum docuisse, priusquam plane Lugduno pellerentur ac dissiparentur. Nam et Valdus vir potens fuit, multosque eum amicos ac cognatos habuisse verisimile est: eoque non tam facile opprimi potuit, nec etiam initio statim durius sacrificios Papæ vexavit, denique nondum erat inducta in Christianitatem ista plusquam barbarica et ethnica crudelitas, in pios tam atrociter grassandi, quam nunc inquisitores passim exercent, quamque potissimum immitissimis istis lupis, pellibus ovium indutis qui se Monachos vocant, debemus: ut taceam illud quod in hac re præcipuum est quod Deus suis, ante persecutionem, discendi spacium ac commoditatem benigne solet concedere.

"Quo tempore proculdubio Valdus et discipulos aliquot egregios ita edocuit ac erudiit, ut ei collegæ esse, officioque docendi recte fungi possent: et doctrinam suam constituisse, seu (ut rectius dicam) Christi doctrinam ac religionem pharisaico Antichristi fermento repurgasse, erroresque ac superstitiones Papæ ac Papistarum inotasse, indicasse et refutasse. Appellati porro sunt non tantum Vualdenses illi homines, sed etiam Pauperes de Lugduno, Leonistæ, et Insabbatati: varia enim illis nomina ab adversariis indita sunt. Atque hæc de ortu, seu potius instauratione hujus veræ Christi religionis ac doctrinæ. Nam etiam adversarii quidam eorum scribunt, alios dicere, inde a Sylvestro perpetuo fuisse horum dogmatum sectatores: alios vero, etiam inde ab apostolis. Jam de ipsis eorum articulis, seu dogmatibus." p. 708.

I suppose that if Illyricus had been called on to prove all this, or even to give reasonable grounds for his probabilities, he would have been puzzled; but it is more important in our present enquiry to observe on Fox's distinct statement, that he found the articles of the Waldenses "in *order* and in *number* to be these." Though he does not say where he found them, yet, I think, nobody will dispute that it was on the same page of Illyricus which contains the Latin which has

been just quoted, and which is immediately followed by the "Articuli Vualdensium" in the same *order*, but not in the same *number*, as in Fox's History.

The Articles of the Waldenses.

I. Only the holy Scripture is to be believed in matters pertaining to salvation, and no man's writing, or man besides.

II. All things which are necessary to salvation are contained in holy Scripture; and nothing is to be admitted in religion but only what is commanded in the word of God.

III. There is one only Mediator; other saints are in no wise to be made mediators, or to be invocated.

IV. There is no purgatory; but all men are either, by Christ, justified to life, or, without Christ, to be condemned: and, besides these two, there is neither any third nor fourth place.

[Omitted.]

V. All masses, namely, such as be sung for the dead, are wicked, and to be abrogate.

VI. All men's traditions ought to be rejected, at least not to be reputed as necessary to salvation; and therefore this singing and superfluous chanting in the chancel is to be left off: constrained and prefixed fasts bound to days and times, difference of meats, such variety of degrees and orders of priests, friars, monks, and nuns, superfluous holidays, so many sundry benedictions and hallowing of creatures, vows, peregrinations, with all the rabblement of rites and ceremonies brought in by man, ought to be abolished.

VII. The supremacy of the pope usurping above all churches, and especially above all politic realms and governments, or for him to occupy or usurp the jurisdiction of both the swords, is to be denied; neither is any degree to be received in the church, but only the degrees of priests, deacons, and bishops.

VIII. The communion under both

Articuli Vualdensium.

1. Solis sacris literis credendum esse in iis quæ ad salutem pertinent, et nulli præterea homini aut scripto, firmiter sentiunt.

2. Sacras literas integre continere omnia ea quæ ad salutem sunt necessaria; eoque nihil penitus recipiendum aut admittendum in religione esse, nisi id solum quod nobis Deus in sacris literis præcepit, indubitanter credunt.

3. Unum esse tantum mediatorem, nec esse invocandos sanctos ulla ratione, statuunt.

4. Purgatorium nullum esse, sed omnes homines vel per Christum justificatos in vitam æternam, vel non credentes in æternum exitium abire, tertium aut quartum locum superesse nullum, aiunt.

5. Tantum duo sacramenta, Baptismum ac Communionem, recipiunt ac probant.

6. Omnes missas, et præcipue eas quæ pro mortuis canuntur, impias, eoque abolendas penitus esse affirmant.

7. Omnes traditiones humanas rejiciendas, vel certe pro necessariis ad salutem nequaquam habendas esse: eoque tollendum esse tantum ac recitationem officii, jejunia ad dies certos alligata, superflua festa, discrimen ciborum, tam varios gradus ac ordines sacerdotum, monachorum ac monacharum, varias benedictiones seu consecrationes creaturarum, vota, peregrinationes et aliam omnem turbam rituum ac cæremoniarum ab hominibus inventarum seu excogitarum antiquandam esse.

8. Primatum Papæ super omnes ecclesias, in primis potestatem ejus supra omnes politias, seu utrumque ejus gladium penitus pernegant, nec censent alios gradus sacerdotales in ecclesia retinendos esse, præter sacerdotum, diaconorum et episcoporum.

9. Communionem sub utraque

kinds is necessary to all people, according to the institution of Christ.

IX. The church of Rome is the very Babylon spoken of in the Apocalypse; and the pope is the fountain of all error, and the very antichrist.

X. The pope's pardons and indulgences they reject.

XI. The marriage of priests, and of ecclesiastical persons, they hold to be godly, and also necessary in the church.

XII. Such as hear the word of God, and have a right faith, they hold to be the right church of Christ; and to this church the keys of the church are to be given, to drive away wolves, and to institute true pastors, and to preach the word, and to minister the sacraments.*

specie et piam esse, necessariam, utpote a Christo ordinatam et præceptam, asserunt.

10. Romanam ecclesiam esse Babylonem, de qua in Apocalypsi: Papam esse omnium errorum fontem, et verum Antichristum contendunt.

11. Indulgentias quoque rejiciunt: tametsi illæ infra quadringentos annos, nempe ante 250 primum a Bonifacio octavo excogitatæ sunt.

12. Conjugium sacerdotum pium ac necessarium in ecclesia esse docent.

13. Verbum Dei audientes, ac recte sentientes, ecclesiam ejus esse, eique ecclesiæ claves a Christo datas, eoque eam posse ac etiam debere lupos fugare, et veros bonosque Christi pastores vocare, et eorum vocem audire ac ab illis sacramenta percipere.
—p. 709.

Here the reader will see, not only that Fox does not give the same number as Illyricus, from whom he copied, but that like him, he affixed a number to each of the articles; and that, by reason of his omitting the fifth, none of the numbers after No. 4 tallied. I will not take upon me to assert that this could not be mere inadvertency, but it certainly does not look like it. Let us hear, however, what the Editor of the Christian Observer says on the subject: "The question is open to consideration, in estimating the value of the history,

* It is but justice to Fox to say, that he translated this article in some respects more correctly. In the edition of 1583, from the text of which the new edition is professedly reprinted, it stands, "Such as heare the word of God, and haue a right fayth, to be the right Church of Christ. And to this Church the Keys of the Church to be geuen, to driue away wolues, and to institute true pastors, to preach the word, and to minister the Sacraments." The editor says, and I have no doubt with a full persuasion of its truth, that "in no single instance has he infringed upon the original intent and meaning of the author." But it is clear that he has unwittingly done it by inserting "are," before "to be," as if they held that the Keys had not yet been given (a Christo datas) but were to be, at some future time—and by inserting "and," before "to preach," as if they held it to be the office of the Church to preach, and not to appoint pastors for that purpose. Before a man undertakes to correct another's style, without altering his meaning, he should be sure that he fully understands that meaning; which in this, and some other cases, the editor certainly did not.

whether Fox, in not mentioning any Waldensian statement of doctrine earlier than this, of nearly a century and a half after the time of Waldo's conversion; and in giving even this not in full, but only 'the most principal articles' wished corruptly to keep back anything that he had not pleasure in bringing forward. *We* most conscientiously and deliberately acquit him of any such artifice. In proceeding in a breath from 'the first occasion and beginning of these men' to 'their articles,' *he gave them as he found them* maturely settled: this was the result of their proceedings: and he passed by earlier and intervening exceptionable or doubtful opinions ascribed to them, either as believing the charges unfounded, or as considering them but as passing clouds, which were not essential features of the landscape. But in order, *in fairness*, to apprise the reader that he had not dotted down, word for word, all that he had read, but had used his own judgment fairly in selecting the most important materials, he adds, 'these be the most principal articles of the Waldenses; albeit some there be that add more to them; some again divide the same into more parts; but these be the principal to which the rest be reduced.' So much for Fox's first statement of Waldensian doctrines, which are pure, scriptural, and essentially Protestant." *July, p. 409.*

I dare say that the Editor was not aware that the words by which Fox 'in fairness' apprised his readers that he had not dotted down all that he had read, are merely a part of the close translation of Illyricus;

These be the principal articles of the Waldenses, albeit some there be that add more to them; some, again, divide the same into more parts; but these be the principal, to which the rest be reduced.

Hi ferme sunt Vualdensium articuli, tamesti alii eos per species latius diducant, pluresque, faciant.

Of this, the editor of the Christian Observer was perhaps not aware—but on what grounds does he talk of Fox's having "passed by" earlier statements of Waldensian opinions?

Has he the least pretence for suggesting that Fox knew of any? The fact that Fox copied from Illyricus seems beyond all doubt; and whether that writer made, or found, these articles, he does not tell us. In the twelfth of the Magdeburgh Centuries, in which Illyricus was subsequently engaged, he says, after talking of the Waldenses, “sed ordine propositiones, quas isti asseruerunt recitabimus;” and then he gives a list somewhat resembling, though considerably differing from, these; and his account is, that he gives it from an old manuscript. He does not tell us where, or how, he found the MS., or where it was when he wrote, or anything about it. “Hæc ex antiquo manuscripto libro proferimus” *—is all that he condescends to say on the subject of authority in a matter so curious.

But again, what does the editor of the Christian Observer mean by talking of Fox's fairness in apprising the reader that he had “used his own judgment fairly in selecting among their articles of faith, when he had before told his reader that Fox “gave them *as he found them* maturely settled”? and when Fox himself had introduced the articles to his readers, with a plain assurance that he *found them* “in order and number to be these”? will any man pretend to doubt that Fox “*found them*” in this book of Illyricus? I do not say (unlikely as it appears to me) that Fox *may not* have omitted that fifth article by mere accident; but his unfortunate advocate would make him tell a direct untruth.

There is another point to be noticed with respect to these articles. The tenth (according to Fox's numbering) is as follows: “The Pope's pardons and indulgences they reject.” This, it will be observed, is not the whole of the article as given by Illyricus. I suppose that Fox omitted the remainder because he did not understand it; and what the meaning of

* Cent. Magd. XII. c. viii. p. 548.

it is, I really do not know. It leads me more than anything else, however, to think that Illyricus may have found, rather than made, these articles; because he might be so far overseen as to print nonsense, which he can scarcely be imagined to have written. Putting principle out of the question, and supposing some kind of inducement to do it (which I do not see) Illyricus must have known that the mention of a Pope of the *fourteenth* century would be enough to sink the whole set of articles; and that he was going out of his way, to state what was not only fatal to the document, but absurd and unintelligible in itself. Fox, however, gives a marginal note, which in the new edition stands as follows: "This article seemeth to be given of them in Bohemia, long after, for indulgences came not in before Boniface VIII." In reference to this, the editor of the Christian Observer says, "it is clear that he did not intend to deceive; for in a marginal note he remarks that this creed must be as recent as the days of Boniface VIII. (the beginning of the fourteenth century), since it contains an allusion to Papal indulgences, which were not heard of till that era." Now this appears to me to be quite a misconception of the case. It must, I think, be evident to everybody that Fox never meant to suggest that "*this creed* must be as recent as the days of Boniface." On the contrary, he singled out *one* distinct article, "The Pope's pardons and indulgences they reject," and put his marginal note against *it*, saying "*this article* seemeth to be given of them in Bohemia *long after*."—"after" *what*? Why, surely, *after* the other articles; which by the very mode of speech, as well as by his way of introducing them, he distinctly shews that he considered as *older* than the days of Boniface VIII. But what can be meant by saying that indulgences "came not in before Boniface VIII."? or, as the editor of the Christian Observer phrases it, "Papal indulgences which were not heard of till that era"?—truly I

believe that there are many persons by whom they have not been heard of to the present moment; but then, though I wish them no evil, and mean them no offence, I must say, that they should not interfere in controversies about the Waldenses.

Hitherto, without naming him, or indeed giving us the least idea how he got his information, Fox has obviously followed Illyricus. There has been no marginal reference of any kind; nor is there any until after his next paragraph, which is as follows:—

The same Waldenses, at length exiled, were dispersed in divers and sundry places, of whom many remained long in Bohemia; who, writing to their king, Uladislaus, to purge themselves against the slanderous accusations of one Dr. Austin, gave up their confession with an apology of their christian profession; defending, with strong and learned arguments, the same which now is received in most reformed churches, both concerning grace, faith, charity, hope, repentance, and works of mercy.

As for purgatory, they say that Thomas Aquinas is the author thereof.

Whether the authors of the document here referred to, were really Waldenses, I doubt almost as much as I do whether Thomas Aquinas was the author of purgatory, or Boniface the VIII. of indulgences. But this is not the place to discuss that question, and they are certainly called so in the document; what we have to observe is, that Fox here gives, for the first time, an authority, telling us that he got his matter “*Ex Orthuino Gratio.*” * The very small part which Fox has quoted from a document occupying more than seventeen close-printed folio pages, he has (I have no doubt unintentionally) misrepresented in one or two particulars; and as we are at present enquiring respecting the value of his authority—that is to say, enquiring how far we may trust to his representations of documents to which we are unable to refer—it may be worth while just to notice them.

The author of the Apology was too learned a man to

* That is from the works more commonly known as the “*Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum.*” It is in Brown’s edition, vol. I, p. 175. It is also in Balthasar Lydius’s *Waldensia*.

have talked of Thomas Aquinas as the “author,” or as Fox’s marginal note has it “first finder of purgatory.” He had said that purgatory is two-fold—in this world and in the world to come—that the former, a state of progressive purification, is certain; being attested by the scriptures and affirmed by our Lord, his apostles, the primitive church, and their followers for a long time—that the latter is uncertain, not founded on scripture, not known to the primitive church, or its followers for a great while, or confirmed by the doctors, especially as to *locality*. But that some moderns, as Thomas Aquinas, had found out that this third place was in hell. And so far was the writer from thinking that Thomas Aquinas was the inventor of the doctrine, that his very next words are “But that ancient Doctor Augustine thought otherwise, saying “the *place* of purgatory is not pointed out,” &c.*

Concerning the supper of the Lord, their faith was, that it was ordained to be eaten, not to be showed and worshipped; that it was for a memorial, not for a sacrifice; to serve for the present ministration, and not for reservation; to be received at the table (not to be carried out of the doors), according to the ancient use of the primitive church, when they used to communicate sitting. And this they prove, both by an old chronicle, called ‘*Chronica Gestorum*,’ as also by ancient Origen, upon the third book of Moses, bringing in his words, which be these, proving that this sacramental bread ought not to be reserved:—“Whosoever receiveth this bread of the supper of Christ upon the second or third day after, his soul shall not be blessed, but polluted. Therefore the Gibeonites, because they brought old bread to the children of Israel, it was enjoined them to carry wood and water,” &c.

I think every reflecting reader will believe, without my copying whole pages to prove it, that this which Fox calls in

* “Primum de Purgatorio, de quo ita credimus. Duplex est purgatorium, unum est hic, alterum in futuro seculo. Primum habet fidem in scripturis sacris, et est certum, in quo se purgant ad immortalia corpora, de quo sunt testificati Salvator et Apostoli et primitiva ecclesia, et sequaces longo tempore bene usi sunt. Secundum purgatorium est in alio mundo; et hoc est incertum, quia scriptura sacra non dat de hoc testimonium, de quo primitiva ecclesia nihil scivit, neque sequaces per longum tempus, et veteres doctores non confirmant, præcipue de loco. Sed proxime, novi quidem, non a longo tempore, ut Thomas Aquinas; is locum invenit tertium in inferno. Sed vetus doctor Augustinus aliter sensit dicens, Locus purgatorii non est ostensus,” &c. p. 179.

his margin "part of the disputation between Dr. Austin and the Waldenses" is not a very complete account of the matter; and that "concerning the Supper of the Lord," these people, be they who they might, believed a good deal more than the few points which Fox here specifies. But, our present business being with his "accuracy of detail," it may be worth while to mention, that he seems to have misconceived the Apologist when he says, "an old Chronicle called *Chronica Gestorum*." I apprehend that the writer meant only a general reference to history when he said, "et hæc institutio diu stetit, sicut *Chronica gestorum* ostendunt, et vetustissimus Græcus Origenes," &c. *p.* 175. By the manner in which the references are put together in the margin of the new edition, it looks as if the words of Origen were quoted from the "*Chronica Gestorum*;" it is precisely by this species of carelessness that innumerable errors arise in history, and that it is so difficult to trace out, and rectify them.

It is not, however, necessary to extract, or to criticise, this account which Fox gives of the dispute of the Waldenses with Dr. Austin. It is more to our present purpose to observe the way in which it is brought in. Fox's very strange and confused way of stringing together extracts, is calculated to produce all the effect of intentional falsehood. The fact which he had just stated was, that the Bishops and Prelates "had driven both Waldus and all the favourers of his true preaching out of the city"—they were "thrust out of country and goods"—and the next sentence of history (their articles of faith only intervening) is, "the same Waldenses, at length exiled, were dispersed in divers and sundry places, of whom many remained long in Bohemia"—long indeed—who would dream that Fox was leaping thus from the twelfth century to a time more recent than John Huss and Jerome of Prague—to quote a document not ten years

older than himself? What was the use of giving a Bohemian confession of 1508? Even the editor of the new edition, who follows his author through a good many quagmires where most people would have deserted him, is out of countenance at Fox's "anticipating the chronological order of history, and rambling into an account of the Bohemian brethren."

Fox proceeds:—

Over and besides, Eneas Sylvius, writing of their doctrine and assertions (perchance as he found them, perchance making worse of them than they taught or meant), reporteth them after this manner, which I thought here to set out as it is in the Latin.

Fox has indeed put in his margin, "Eneas Sylvius, Bohemica historia de Waldensium dogmatibus;" but I think the reader will hardly doubt that he was getting back to Illyricus, who gives us an extract headed "Ex Ænea Sylvii Bohemica Historia, de Vualdensium dogmatibus"—which heading Fox seems to have taken for the title of the book.

The English of the Same.

That the bishop of Rome is equal with other bishops. That amongst priests there is no difference of degree. That no priest is to be reputed for any dignity of his order, but for the worthiness of his life.

That the souls of men departed are either to enter into pain everlasting, or everlasting joy. That there is no fire of purgatory to be found. That to pray for the dead is vain, and a thing only found out for the lucre of priests.

That the images of God (as of the Trinity), and of saints, are to be abolished. That the hallowing of water and palms is a mere ridicule. That the religion of begging friars was found out by the devil. That priests should not encroach riches in this world, but rather follow poverty, being content with their tithes, and men's devotion. That the preaching of the word is free to all men called thereunto.

That no deadly sin is to be tolerated, for whatsoever respect of a

Romanum præsullem reliquis episcopis parem esse. Inter sacerdotes nullum discrimen. presbyterum non dignitatem, sed vitæ meritum efficere potiozem.

Animas e corporibus excedentes, aut in æternas e vestigio pœnas mergi, aut perpetua consequi gaudia. Purgatorium ignem nullum inveniri. Vanum esse orare pro mortuis, et avaritiæ sacerdotalis inventum.

Dei et sanctorum imagines delendas. Aquarum, palmarumque benedictiones irridendas. Mendicantium religiones malos dæmones invenisse. Sacerdotes pauperes esse debere, sola contentos eleemosyna. Liberam cuique prædicationem verbi Dei patere.

Nullum capitale peccatum, quantumvis majoris mali vitandi gratia,

greater commodity to ensue thereupon. That the confirmation, which bishops exercise with oil, and extreme unction, are not to be counted among the sacraments of the church. That auricular confession is but a toy; and that it suffices for every man to confess himself in his chamber to God. That baptism ought to be administered only with pure water, without any mixture of hallowed oil. That the temple of the Lord is the wide world. That the majesty of God is not to be restrained within the walls of temples, monasteries, and chapels, so that his grace is rather to be found in one place than in another.

That priest's apparel, ornaments of the high altar, vestments, corporaces, chalices, patines, and other church plate, serve in no stead. For the difference and respect of the very place makes no matter, where the priest doth consecrate, or doth minister to those who do require. That it is sufficient to use only the sacramental words, without any other superfluous ceremonies.

That the suffrages of saints, reigning with Christ in heaven, are craved in vain; they being not able to help us. That in saying or singing the hours and matins of the day, the time is but lost. That a man ought to cease from his labour no day, but only upon the Sunday.

That the feasts and festivals of saints ought to be rejected. Item, that such fasts as be coacted and enjoined by the church have no merit in them.

Before I offer any remarks on these articles I must give the sentence which follows them:—

“These assertions of the Waldenses being thus articulated by Eneas Sylvius, I thought to give them abroad in English as they are in Latin, to the intent that as they are the less to be doubted, being set out by a pope's pen, so we may both the better know them hereby, what they were, and also understand how this doctrine, now preached and taught in the church, is no new doctrine, which here we see both taught and persecuted almost four hundred years ago.”

Surely after this, in addition to the declaration with

tolerandum. Qui mortalis culpæ reus sit, eum neque sæculari, neque ecclesiastica dignitate potiri, neque parendum ei. Confirmationem, quam chrismate pontifices inducunt, et extremam unctionem, inter ecclesiæ sacramenta minime contineri. Auricularem confessionem nugacem esse: sufficere, sua quemque Deo in cubili suo confiteri peccata. Baptisma fluvialis unde, nulla interjecta sacri olei mixtura, recipiendum. cimiteriorum inanem usum, quæstus causa repletum: quacunque tegantur tellure humana corpora, nil distare. Templum Dei late patentis ipsum mundum esse. Coarctare majestatem ejus, qui ecclesias monasteria, oratoriaque construunt, tanquam propitiis in eis divina bonitas inveniatur.

“Sacerdotales vestes, altarum ornamenta, pallas, corporalia, calices, patinas, vasaque hujusmodi nil habere momenti. Sacerdotem quocumque loco sacrum Christi corpus conficere posse, petentibusque ministrare: sufficere, si verba sacramentalia tantum dicat.

Suffragia sanctorum in cœlis cum Christo regnantium frustra impetrari, quæ juvare non possunt. In canonicis horis cantandis dicendisque frustra tempus teri. Nulla die ab opere cessandum nisi quæ Dominica nunc appellatur.

Celebritates sanctorum prorsus rejiciendas. Jejunii quoque, ab ecclesiis institutis, nihil inesse meriti.” p. 760.

which they were introduced, it is not unreasonable to expect that we should find the English a *mere* translation (whether more or less free) of the Latin. There is no pretence here for talking of Fox's using his own judgment in *selecting*. On them I would remark,

1. That whatever may be said of Fox's apprising his reader that the whole, or any part, of the articles before given, was more recent than the time of Boniface, yet here he particularly states that these are the doctrines which were persecuted "almost four hundred years ago."

2. The Latin states that ministers should be supported by *alms only*—the English gives them *tithes* also.

3. The Latin states that the preaching of the word is free *to all men*; the English contradicts this by adding "called thereunto."

4. The Latin states that he who is guilty of mortal sin cannot hold any dignity, secular or ecclesiastical, and is not to be obeyed; the English entirely omits the statement.

Some other variations the reader who examines will find; but these appear to me very important. Whether Æneas Sylvius reported truly, has nothing to do with the question; surely these assertions of the Waldenses are not "in English as they are in Latin." I do not affirm that Fox *must* have taken them from Illyricus (though the fact that almost every word of his history, except what he refers to Orthuinus Gratius, is from that source, and his adoption of the heading in this case, leave scarcely any room for doubt), and I shall be most thankful to have it shewn that he had somewhere else fallen in with a garbled copy, which he supposed to be correct. Though even then he ought to have told us where he got it, and not to have vouched that Eneas Sylvius "reported them after this manner."*

* Not having at present access to the work of Æneas Sylvius, and thinking it possible that Illyricus might not have extracted accurately, I requested a

If, however, a shadow of doubt can be raised, whether Fox took as the foregoing list of Waldensian articles from Illyricus, there can, I apprehend, be no doubt about what follows, which is to be found on the leaf immediately preceding that on which Illyricus gives the testimony of Eneas Sylvius :

And as I have spoken hitherto sufficiently concerning their doctrine, so now we will briefly somewhat touch of the order of their life and conversation, as we find it registered in a certain old written book of inquisition.

*Manners and Customs of the
Waldenses.*

The whole process cometh to this effect. The manner of the Waldenses is this. Kneeling upon their knees, leaning against some bank or stay, they do continue in their prayers in silence, as long as a man may say thirty or forty times, Pater noster. And this they do every day with great reverence, being amongst themselves and such as be of their own religion, and no strangers with them, both before dinner and after; likewise before supper and after; also at what time they go to bed, and in the morning when they rise, and at certain other times also, as well in the day as in the night. Item, they use no other prayer but the prayer of the Lord, and that without any Ave Maria, and the creed, which they affirm not to be put in as any prayer by Christ, but only by the church of Rome. Albeit they have and use the seven articles of faith concerning the divinity, and seven articles concerning the humanity, and the ten commandments, and seven works of mercy, which they have compiled together in a compendious book, glo-

*Et alio Inquisitorio libello.
De modo orandi Waldensium.*

Modus autem Vualdensium talis est, videlicet quod flexis genibus in terra inclinant, et opponunt se super aliquam bancham, vel consimile ad hoc aptum, &c. Flexis genibus inclinati stant in omnib. orationib. in silentio ita diu, quod possunt dicere triginta vel quadraginta Pater noster, et amen aliquoties: et hoc faciunt cotidie reverenter, quando sunt cum credentibus suis, et consentientibus in facto ipsorum, sine aliis extraneis, ante prandium et post, et ante cœnam et post, et de nocte quando volunt ire ad lectum, et antequam reponant se. Item, de mane postquam surrexerunt de lecto: Item aliquibus aliis vicibus per diem, tam de mane quam de nocte. Item, nullam aliam orationem dicunt, nec docent, nec habent, nisi orationem Dominicam Pater noster, &c., nec aliud reputant Salutationem Angelicam Ave Maria, nec Symbolum Apostolorum Credo in Deum. Et dicunt illa per Romanam Ecclesiam, non per Christum fuisse ordinata, seu composita. Verumtamen articulos fidei septem de Divinitate, et septem

friend to collate the passage. He informs me that it agrees with the edition of 1592, cap. xxxv. p. 76-78, with these three exceptions—for *inventum* (line 11 of the Latin, p. 29) it has *inventivum*—for *quocunque loco sacrum* (line 25, p. 30) it has *quocunque loco, quocunque tempore, sacrum*—for *prorsus* (line 36, p. 30) it has *rursus*. The second of these variations furnishes additional reason to believe that Fox was translating from the passage as it stands in Illyricus.

rying much in the same, and thereby offer themselves ready to answer any man as to their faith.

Before they go to meat they have this grace, "Benedicite, Kyrie eleyson, Christe eleyson, Kyrie eleyson, Pater noster." Which being said, then the elder amongst them beginneth thus, in their own tongue: "God who blessed the five barley loaves and two fishes in the desert before his disciples, bless this table, and what is set upon it, or shall be set upon it: in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." And likewise again, when they rise from meat, the senior giveth thanks, saying, in the words of the Apocalypse, "Blessing, and worship, and wisdom, and thanksgiving; honour, virtue, and strength, to God alone, for ever and ever. Amen." And addeth, moreover, "God reward them in their bosoms, and be beneficial to all them that be beneficial to us, and bless us. And the God who hath given us corporal feeding, grant us his spiritual life, and God be with us, and we always with him." To which they answer again, "Amen." And thus saying grace, they hold their hands upward, looking up to heaven. After their meat and grace said, they teach and exhort amongst themselves, conferring together upon their doctrine, &c.

de Humanitate, et decem præcepta, et septem opera misericordiæ, sub quodam compendio quodammodo ab eis ordinato et composito dicunt et docent, et in illo plurimum gloriantur et statim offerunt se promptos ad respondendum de fide sua.

Antequam ponant se ad mensam, benedicunt eam dicendo: Benedicite, Kyrie eleyson, Christe eleyson, Kyrie eleyson, Pater noster: quo dicta, antiquior inter eos dicit in vulgari: Deus, qui benedixit quinque panes hordeaceos et duos pisces in deserto, coram discipulis suis, benedicit hanc mensam, et ea quæ sunt super eam, et ea quæ apponentur in ea (et faciunt signum crucis) in nomine Patris, et et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen. Item quando surgunt de mensa in prandio et in cœna, reddunt gratias, hoc modo videlicet, quod antiquior dicit in vulgari, id quod habetur in Apocalypsi: Benedictio et claritas et sapientia et gratiarum actio, honor, virtus et fortitudo, Deo soli in secula sæculorum, Amen. Et postea subdit: Deus reddat bonam mercedem et bonam cambium omnibus illis qui benefaciunt nobis, et benedicunt nobis. &c, Deus qui dedit nobis cibum corporalem, det vitam spiritualement: et Deus sit nobiscum, et nos cum eo semper: et alii respondent, Amen. Item quando benedicunt mensam, et quando reddunt gratias, tenent ut frequenter manus junctas, et elevant versus cœlum. Item post prandium dictis gratiis, et facta oratione, ut supra, prædicant et docent, et faciunt exhortationes suas de doctrina sua." p. 757.

The reader will perhaps observe one or two inaccuracies in the Latin which I have not thought it worth while to correct, as it is my wish to give such reprints as exactly as possible; because, as I have before observed on a similar occasion, if a misprint is obvious and certain it can do no harm, and if it is not, the reader ought to have the opportunity of judging whether it exists. The only thing of the sort worth mentioning on this occasion is, that *aliud*, in the twenty-second line of the Latin, seems as if it should be

aliquid. On the translation it may be sufficient to offer two remarks.

1. The Inquisitor according to the translation, testified of the heretics, "they use no other prayer but the prayer of the Lord, and that without any Ave Maria, and the Creed, which they affirm *not* to be *put in as any prayer* by Christ, but only by the church of Rome." What could he mean—what heresy was that—where has the church of Rome "put in" the Apostles' Creed "as [or according to former editions, "for",] any prayer?" The reader, who has not Illyricus's book to refer to, will be puzzled to know why any one should so translate the Latin; but in fact this is one of the bold strokes of that writer. He found the Inquisitor, as appears by the words which he has given, plainly charging the heretics of whom he wrote with rejecting the Salutation and the Apostles' Creed, classing them together as human compositions made up by the Romish Church—what was he to do? He wrote in his margin "Id est, negant symbolum esse orationem." That was all—they only denied that the Apostles' Creed was a prayer. This stroke of his has had some success. What he put in his margin is, in the English translation wrought into the text, and given as the testimony of the Inquisitor; and, if not very intelligible, it may yet be read without scandal. Nay, the only feeling which it would be likely to excite, in the minds of most readers, would be that of pity for the stupid Inquisitor, who could think it worth while to record so singular a heresy.

2. The translation omits the statement, in the tenth line of the second paragraph of the Latin, that in saying grace they made the sign of the cross.

The next paragraph of Fox is as follows:—

In their doctrine and teaching they were so diligent and painful, that Reinerius, a writer about that time (an extreme enemy against them),

Verum cum ipsorum Waldensium vetustiora scripta haberi nequeant, apponemus hic Papistæ eujuspiam, Reinerii, ut opinor, summam pro-

in a long process, wherein he describeth their doctrine and teaching, testifieth that he heard of one who did know the party, "that a certain heretic," saith he, "only to turn a certain person away from our faith, and to bring him to his, in the night, and in the winter time, swam over the river called Ibis, to come to him, and to teach him." Moreover, so perfect they were then in the Scriptures, that the said Reinerius saith, he did hear and see a man of the country unlettered, who could recite over the whole book of Job word by word, without book, with divers others, who had the whole New Testament perfectly by heart.

And although some of them rather merrily than skilfully expounded the words of St. John, "Sui non receperunt eum"—"Swine did not receive him;" yet were they not so ignorant and void of learning, nor yet so few in number, but that they did mightily prevail; insomuch that Reinerius hath these words: "There was none durst stop them for the power and multitude of their favourers. I have often been at their inquisition and examination, and there were numbered forty churches infected with their heresy, insomuch that in one parish of Cammach were ten open schools of them," &c.

And the said Reinerius, when he hath said all he can in depraving and impugning them, yet is driven to confess this of them, where he doth distinguish their sect from other sects, and hath these words: "This sect of Leonists hath a great show of holiness, in that they both live justly before men, and believe all things well of God, and hold all the articles contained in the creed; only they do blaspheme the Romish church, and hate it," &c.

All this is to be found in Illyricus certainly: and after what we have seen it would be natural to suppose that Fox took it from thence. There is, however, I believe, another reason for supposing this—namely, that when Fox wrote, these passages of Reinerius had not been printed anywhere but in this book of Illyricus. I am aware that "ex

lixam dogmatum ipsorum, forte ante 300 annos confectam, et a nobis ex veteri membranaceo libro desumptum. Etsi autem is ipse Valdensem adversarius, durissimis ac odiosis verbis eorum dogmata proponit." p. 723.

Audivi ab ore credentis cujusdam, quod quidam hæreticus, quem novi, ad hoc tantum, ut eum a fide nostra averteret, et ad suam perduceret, perverteretque, nocte hyemali tempore per aquam, quæ dicitur Ibis, natavit ad ipsum.

Vidi et audivi rusticum idiotam, qui Job recitavit de verbo ad verbum: et plures alios, qui novum Testamentum totum sciverunt perfecte.

Et quia sunt laici idiotæ false et corrupte exponunt scripturam, ut Joan 1. Sui, id est porci, eum non receperunt. sui dicentes, id est, sues. p. 724.

Non erat qui eos impedire auderet, propter potentiam et multitudinem fautorum suorum. Inquisitioni et examinationi frequenter interfui. Et computatæ sunt 40 Ecclesiæ, quæ hæresi infectæ fuerunt. ac in sola parrochia Cammach fuerunt decem scholæ hæreticorum." p. 726.

Hæc Leonistarum magnam habens speciem pietatis, eo quod coram hominibus juste vivant, et bene omnia de Deo credant, et omnes articulos qui in symbolo continentur: solam Romanam ecclesiam blasphemant, et oderunt:" p. 726.

Orthuino Gratio" stands in Fox's margin against one sentence of it, and I do not take upon me to say that there may not be extracts from Reinerius in the work so referred to; but I rather think that it is only a mistake, and that the marginal reference has got out of its place.

It is more important to enquire what Fox really gives us as the testimony of Reinerius; and in doing this we shall find further evidence that he was copying from Illyricus. As to Fox's representing that Reinerius "hath said all he can in depraving and impugning" the Leonists, it is of course mere exaggeration; but Reinerius certainly does say of them, that, being ignorant men, they made blunders in attempting to translate the scriptures; and specifies that in the first chapter of St. John they had mistaken the word *sui* for *sues*. How was Illyricus, who was, as we have seen, very jealous for the learning of Waldo and his followers, to meet this statement? He wrote in his margin (and what an idea does it give us of the man), "est pius jocus." This impudent—surely I might say profane and disgusting—suggestion Fox seems to have adopted, but to have somewhat modified, by inserting *videtur*, as not venturing, I suppose, to say positively that these eminently holy and enlightened Leonists considered the rejection of Christ by "his own," as matter for a pious joke, or that the lewdness of Christ's ministers was a thing to be laughed at. Whether Fox further altered *jocus* into *locus*, as it now stands in the new edition, I really do not know. It is certainly *locus* in the edition of 1596 and of 1684; but in that of 1583, which is the professed ground work of the new edition, I really feel uncertain whether the letter which begins the word is an *I* or an *l*. The type is so worn, and, in my copy at least, the impression so defective, that I know not how to decide; but if Fox did not read *jocus*, how came he by the idea that they did it "merrily"?

There is, however, another point to be noticed in con-

nection with this *pious locus* or *jocus*, whichever it may be. A joke is two-fold in its nature. I do not mean that it may be pious or impious, for in the present case it seems as if one and the same joke might be both. It might be very jocular of the Waldenses purposely to translate the word of God in this way, or it might be a good joke to enlightened people of the present day to see early ignorance making such blunders. Wherein lay the merriment? Was it in the Waldenses laughing at the priests, or is it in us laughing at the Waldenses? Fox plainly says one thing; his new Editor makes him say the other. Fox tells us that the Leonists *meant* to be facetious; his new Editor represents the joke as lying against them. Fox, in the editions of 1583, 1596, (and, as far as I know, in all others) tells us that they did it “rather merely than *unskilfully*.” He maintains that it was a piece of wit, and no want of skill; but his new Editor makes him say that they did it “rather merrily than *skilfully*.” On what ground does he make this alteration?

Now to touch somewhat their persecutions:—After they were driven out of Lyons, they were scattered into divers and sundry places, the providence of God so disposing, that the sound of their doctrine might be heard abroad in the world. Some, as I said, went to Bohemia; many did flee into their provinces of France; some into Lombardy; others into other places, &c. But as the cross commonly followeth the verity and sincere preaching of God's word, so neither could these be suffered to live in rest. There are yet to be seen the consultations of lawyers, archbishops, and bishops of France, as Narbonensis, Arelatensis, Aquensis, and Albanensis, devised amongst themselves, which yet remain in writing, for the abolishing and extirpating of these Waldenses, written above three hundred years ago; whereby it appeareth that there was a great number of them in France.

Besides, there was a whole council kept in Toulouse about three hundred and fifty-five years before, and all

Accidit procul dubio non tantum humana aut diabolica persecutorum malitia sed multo magis divino consilio, sicut Apostolorum tempore ut crudelitate impiorum Lugduno pellerentur, ac per varias mundi regiones dissiparentur, quo scilicet in omnem terram sonus eorum exiret, et veritatis lux dispergeretur. Aufugerunt igitur Lugduno, partim in varias Galliæ partes, et præsertim in Narbonensem provinciam: partim, et quidem plures, in Lombardiam, Italiæ provinciam, quam Romani citeriorem Galliam vocarunt. Habeo consultationes jurisperitorum Avinionensium, item Archiepiscoporum Narbonensis, Arelatensis et Aquensis, item ordinationem Albanensis episcopi, de extirpandis Vualdensibus, jam ante annos 300 scriptas: ex quibus apparet, plurimos passim in tota Gallia fuisse.

Fuit et integrum concilium Tolosæ contra Vualdenses celebratum, circiter ante annos 355. sed prius in alio

against these Waldenses, who also were condemned in another council at Rome before that.

What great persecutions were raised up against them in France by these four archbishops before mentioned, it appeareth by their writings; whereof I will recite some of their words, which towards the end be these:—"Who is such a stranger that knoweth not the condemnation of the Waldenses, the heretics, done and past so many years ago, so famous, so public, followed upon with so great labours, expenses, and travail of the faithful, and sealed with so many deaths of these infidels, so solemnly being condemned and openly punished?"—Whereby we may see persecution to be no new thing in the church of Christ, when Antichrist so long before, even three hundred years, began to rage against these Waldenses.

Romæ celebrato damnati fuere. Amplissimum vero numerum fuisse jam olim Vualdensium, gravissimasque contra eos persecutiones institutas, facile ex prædicta trium Archiepiscoporum Gallicorum consultatione ante ante annos scripta apparet. Nam sub finem ejus ita scribunt: Quis enim est solus ille peregrinus, qui condemnationem hæreticorum Vualdensium ignoret, a longis retro annis tam justissime factam, tam famosam, tam publicam, tot et tantis laboribus expensis et sudoribus fidelium insequutum, et tot mortibus ipsorum infidelium solenniter damnatorum, publiceque punitorum, tam fortiter sigillatam? Ex quibus verbis facile apparet, et multos Vualdenses jam olim ante 300 annos in multis locis fuisse, et magnam tetramque eorum lanienam Antichristum cum suis exercuisse." p. 711.

One would suppose the Lawyers, Archbishops, and Bishops, all to have consulted together against the Waldenses "amongst themselves;" instead of which Illyricus speaks of some consultations of Lawyers at Avignon, of the Council of the Archbishops of Narbonne, Arles, and Aix, (or what is commonly called the Council of Narbonne in 1235), and of an ordinance of the Bishop of Albano, which was perfectly distinct from both. Indeed, as it related to the extirpation of heresy in France, one would suppose that *Albanensis* should be *Albiensis*, forasmuch as the Bishop of Albi was in the midst of it. But this is not to our present purpose, which is only to enquire respecting Fox's accuracy, and the confidence which we may place in his translations. It will be seen that he afterwards makes these Prelates into *four* Archbishops, even in translating Illyricus's "*trium Archiepiscoporum*;" and when he here immediately follows up his account of consultations held "three hundred years ago," with an account of a Council held "three hundred and fifty-five years *before*," who would not suppose that he was speaking of a Council three hundred and fifty-five years

before the consultations? When placed beside the Latin it is seen to be only a too literal translation of Illyricus, whom Fox followed so implicitly as not to recollect that what happened three hundred and fifty-five years before Illyricus wrote, must have happened somewhat longer before he wrote himself.

But as to this Council which Fox says was held “*all against these Waldenses,*”—he very naturally argues that they must have been numerous in France at that time. He makes the Council speak as if not only its own deliberations, but the swords of the Crusaders, had been directed against the Waldenses exclusively. All this, however, depends on the omission of one little word, which makes a most important difference. The Council did not speak of “*heretic Waldenses;*” but “*heretics and Waldenses.*” Their words are “*hæreticorum et Valdensium,*”—not as Illyricus (who has misled Fox) gives them, “*hæreticorum Valdensium.*” This difference is very important in the controversy respecting the number of Waldenses then in France, and yet more so as to the identity of the Albigenses and Waldenses; but this is not the place to discuss it. It is enough here to say that Illyricus may have omitted the *et* either by accident or design; but that the omission is not to be accounted for by any various reading, or any shift of that kind, because the Council throughout speaks of the “*hæretici*” (whomsoever they might mean by the term) as contradistinguished from the Waldenses. The points for our consideration are that Fox, with all the Editor of the Christian Observer’s pretence of his laborious examination of testimony, seems to have known nothing about the Council of Thoulouse but what he got from Illyricus, whom he does not name; and that, following him, he has misquoted the document, and raised an erroneous argument on the misquotation respecting a point of very great importance in the controversy. He proceeds:

In Bohemia, likewise, after that, the same, called by the name of Thaborites, as Sylvius recordeth, suffered no little trouble.

As to the next paragraph, I think there can be no dispute that Fox was indebted to the long extract from Sleidan which Illyricus gives, just in the very part of his work from which we have had so many extracts:—

But never persecution was stirred up against them, or any other people more terrible than was in these latter years in France by the French king, A. D. 1545, which lamentable story is described in Sleidan, and hereafter, in the process of this book, as we come to the order of years, shall be set forth, by the grace of Christ, more at large; in the which persecution is declared, in one town, Cabriera, to be slain by the captain of Satan, Reinerius, eight hundred persons at once, without respect of women or children of any age; of whom forty women, and most of them great with child, thrust into a barn, and the windows kept with pikes, and so fire set to them, were all consumed. Besides, in a cave not far from the town Mussium, to the number of five and twenty persons with smoke and fire were at the same time destroyed. At Merindolum the same tyrant, seeing all the rest were fled away, and finding one young man, caused him to be tied to an olive-tree, and to be destroyed with torments most cruelly; with much other persecution, as shall appear hereafter in the history translated out of Sleidan into English.

“Testatur vero Sylvius, apud Tabo-
ritas Vadensem doctrinam regnasse ...
.....Thaboritæ, qui revera Valden-
sium dogma sunt sequuti, licet Hussitæ
videri vellent, et ex cœtu ejus pro-
diissent, gravissime sunt vexati et
oppugnati,” &c. p. 722–723.

“Cæterum ii ipsi homines demum
anno 1545, fuerunt a rege gravissime
ac crudelissime afflicti, vel potius
funditus deleti et exterpati. Quæ
illorum bonorum virorum miseranda
calamitas, adversariorumq; plusquam
Turcica crudelitas, est tum separatim
quodam Gallico libello exposita, tum
et a Sledano compendio comprehensa,
cujus locum adscribam.” p. 712.

“Cæsorum numerus repertus est
tam in oppido quam foris, numero ad
cotingentos.” p. 717.

“Trucidantur ad unum fere omnes,
non viri tantum, sed et mulieres, ple-
ræque gravidæ. Minerius etiam ad
quadraginta circiter fæminas in hor-
reum straminis atque feni plenum
includit, post ignem subjicit et incen-
dit: cum illæ vestibus exutis con-
arentur flammam nascentem restinguere,
neque possent, ad majorem fenestram,
qua fenum recondi solet in horreum,
advolant, ut sese ejiciant: sed ibi
repulsæ telis et hastis, conflagrarunt
omnes.” p. 716.

“Non procul ab oppido Mussio,
quod ante diximus, quidam ingressi
cavernam sub rupe latitabant, numero
ad viginti quinque: sed proditi fu-
mo fuerunt omnes et igni enecati.”
p. 717.

“Cum vacuum habitatoribus reper-
isset, diripit ac incendit, edito prius
exemplo valde crudeli. Nam adole-
scentem unicum ibi nactus, religari
jubet ad oleam, et tormentis occidi.”
p. 716.

On this it is unnecessary to make any remark, except that the Editor of the new edition has changed *Minerius* into *Reinerius*, both in the text and the margin, without, so far

as I can see, the least reason. It is so plain, both in black and Roman letter, in the edition which he professed to follow, that one can only suppose the alteration to have been intended; and that here, as well as elsewhere, he thought that he was correcting an error, when he was, in fact, adding to the vast number of mistakes which it was his business to remove. Fox proceeds:—

But to return again to higher times, from whence we digressed. Besides that, Reinerius (above mentioned), speaketh of one in the town of Cheron, a glover, who was brought at this time to examination, and suffered.

“Cum quidam hæresiarcha hæreticus chirothecarius in Cheron ducetur ad mortem, dixit,” &c. p. 726.

Furthermore, it was Illyricus who happened to have the “old monument of process” of which Fox speaks, and of which I give the account as it stands, though there is obviously a misprint of addition or omission with respect to the number of persons examined. In this original edition of Illyricus, from which I copy, it seems quite clear that the 44 never had a 3 after it, and the want of it must have been particularly conspicuous to any corrector of the press, from its being quite the end of a line beginning a new paragraph.

There is also an old monument of process, wherein appear four hundred and forty-three to be brought to examination in Pomerania, Marchia, and places thereabouts, about A. D. 1391.

“Habeo quoque magnum processuum volumen in quo 44 Valdenses nominatim examinati sunt in Pomerania, Marchia, et vicinis locis, circa annum Domini 1391.....nam ubi 443 nominatim sunt examinati,” &c. p. 721.

And thus much touching the origin, doctrine, and lamentable persecutions of the Waldenses; who, as is declared first began about the time of this King Henry II.

Such is Fox’s history of the Waldenses—there is, however, one thing more connected with it which must be noticed, before we enquire into the honesty of representing Fox as one who had made “a laborious examination of testimony” as to Waldo’s ability to translate the Scriptures, and such a “scrutiny” of documents in general relating to the Waldenses, as that a particular confession could not have

escaped him. It is this—that, a few pages after, he represents these Waldenses as monks—or to borrow the smoother language of the Editor of the new edition, “for want of an *accurate distinction* between different sects and different religious orders, Fox has fallen into *the error* of placing ‘Waldensis’ sect’ among what he calls a ‘rabble of popish religious orders.’” p. 353. An “error” certainly, and one that is not to be got over quite so easily as the Editor seems to think; which is, at all events, most important for our present view of the case; for if a writer is to tell us at p. 263 that the Waldenses were raised up by Christ against the pride and hypocrisy of the popish orders, and at p. 352, that they were part of a rabble “set up” by the Pope, what can we say of his authority? Ought not a writer of ecclesiastical history to make “an accurate distinction between different sects?” The Editor of Fox tells us that he was led into this very absurd blunder by “copying inadvertently”—be it so; there are too many proofs that Fox copied “inadvertently” (or at least copied what he had not taken sufficient pains to understand and consider) to allow of our doubting that it might be so—but is such inadvertence consistent with anything like the deliberate and digested knowledge which would render a man’s opinion or statements on such subjects worth appealing to?

What then is Fox’s authority in the matter? His history of the Waldenses is, with the exception of what he professes to have taken from Orthuinus Gratius, almost entirely a mere plagiarism from Illyricus—a writer to whom he does not make the most distant allusion. He mentions him, indeed, elsewhere, and gives ample proof that he knew the book which in this case he followed almost exclusively; but here there is nothing which should lead a reader to doubt, any more than the Editor of the *Christian Observer* seems to have done, that Fox had seen the parchment monuments to

which he referred, and that he had for himself consulted Æneas Sylvius, Reinerius, and Sleidan. I feel it right, however, in reply to the Editor of the Christian Observer's question, "Does Fox falsify or unfairly abridge or partially select documents?" to offer a few more general observations on Fox's conduct in respect of authorities. At the same time I wish to be considered as speaking exclusively of that portion of the history which is contained in the volume of the new edition just published. It happens to be the part of the work with which I was previously most acquainted, and though I do not at all know that it would be unjust to extend these remarks to the whole, yet I do not feel authorised to do it.

1. Fox frequently gives no authority at all. No one who reads a few pages will require any proof of this. It may happen that the reader knows of some source; but if not, it is impossible that he should know what was Fox's authority, or whether he had any.

2. He frequently gives his authority in so vague and uncertain a manner, that it is of no use. What does the reader learn by such references as these—"Taken out of the English story or chronicle compiled by certain English clerks. 82.—Ex historia ignoti authoris. 83.—Ex Jornal.; Malmesb.; Polydor.; Fab. *et aliis*. 87.—Jornalensi *et aliis*. 167.—Ex Chron. Angli incerti autoris. 184.—it is said in a certain old chronicle before mentioned. 185.—Ex incerti authoris Chronico. 186.—Nichol. Trivet. *et alii*. 188.—Ex Chronico Bibliothecæ Cariensis—Ex vetusto manuscripto exemplari historiæ Cariensis—Ex vetusto Chron. acephalo. 271.—Ex Chron. cujus initium 'In diebus sanctissimi regis Edvardi;' &c. Ex Biblioth. Cariensi. 272. [that is an "old written chronicle remaining in the hands of one William Cary, Citizen of London." p. 273 and 655.] Ex Chronico pervetusto, cui initium 'In diebus sanctis. regis,' &c. 273.—Ex

historia manuscripta cui initium, 'Rex Pictorum.' Ex Bibliotheca Cariensi mutuata. 274.—Ex veteri Chronico manuscripto, cui initium, 'Anno gratiæ millesimo,' &c. 280.—Ex lib. anonymo, et ex Hist. Gervasii monachi Cantuariensis. 295.—Ex veteri Chronico manuscripto anonymo, de gestis Ricardi Regis, cui initium, 'Anno gratiæ,' &c. Item ex alio ejusdem vetustatis chronico manuscripto, cui initium, 'Eneas cum Ascanio,' &c. 305.—Ex Matth. Paris.; et ex aliis incerti nominis manuscriptis codicibus. 315.—Ex variis Chron. 317.—Ex Chronico vetusto Angliæ. 343," &c.

How is one (without making such a business of it as belongs only to an editor) to trace a writer who refers to such authorities, in such a way? and who could have believed that such a book could have been reprinted in the present day without some examination as to what these authorities were? Surely those who found the publishers rejoicing that they were "enabled to calculate on the most important assistance in the facilities offered by Public Libraries" for the collation of editions of Fox's own work, would take it for granted that they would employ an editor who, with such facilities, and very moderate knowledge and industry, might have found out what some, at least, of these books, really were, and whether they were books of credit.

But this is not the worse species of vague reference; for if Fox tells us that he took a fact "ex lib. anonymo" we may feel ourselves at liberty to doubt or to reject, and are not bound to enquire very deeply into the matter. But when he says that his authority is Matthew Paris, or Roger Hoveden, or any other writer of credit, we do not like peremptorily to decide that he is mistaken because we cannot find any thing like what he says, even when we are morally certain that we have got the place on which he grounds his assertion, and that there is nothing else in the author referred to which can support his statement. If people are

not intended to look out the references, it would be as well not to give any; if they are to do it when they doubt a statement, or wish for further information respecting it, the references should be intelligible, and given in such a manner as to facilitate enquiry. One or two specimens will illustrate my meaning. Fox says:—

“Great slaughter at the same time there was of them who were called Catini, about the parts of Almain. These Catini were esteemed of Pope Gregory and the papists to be heretics, but what their opinions were, I find it not expressed in Matthew Paris.” p. 409.

I print it as it stands in the new edition. In that of 1583, p. 280, Matthew Paris is more distinctly given as a reference by the mode of printing; the paragraph ending “I find it not expressed. *In Parisiens.*”—the first five words being in black letter, and the others in Roman, as Fox commonly gave his authorities. Now, having a good deal to do with heretics of the thirteenth century, I should be glad to know whether there ever were any called Catini, for I do not remember to have heard of them elsewhere; but if I turn to Matthew Paris, I search in vain for any such name. If I look in the year noted in Fox’s margin, I find that (having spoken of a slaughter of the “*hæretici Albigeneses*” in the paragraph immediately preceding, of which Fox speaks in his paragraph next following) Matthew Paris says “*Similiter in partibus Alemanix fines contingentibus, hæreticos quosdam multiplicatos consimili miseria involvit Deus omnipotens,*” &c. I feel, of course, no doubt that Fox alluded to this passage, but though it says nothing of Catini, how am I to know, without reading Matthew Paris through, whether Fox’s statement is true or false? It may be said that it is of little consequence whether the people were called Catini, or by any other name; but that is not the question—the question is, how far may we trust the fidelity and care and understanding of a writer in cases where we have not

the means of turning to his authority, if we find so little satisfaction when we do?

3. Fox sometimes gave one authority when he was, in fact, using another;—that is, he borrowed authorities. The History of the Waldenses may, perhaps, furnish sufficient proof of this; but it would be easy to multiply instances. One or two I will mention. At p. 182, of the new edition, Fox says:—

“Certain histories make mention of one Arnulph, in the time of this Pope Honorius II. Some say he was Archbishop of Lugdune, as Hugo, Platina, Sabellicus. Trithemius saith he was a priest, whose history, as it is set forth in Trithemius, I will briefly in English express. About this time, saith he, in the days of Honorius II., one Arnulph, a priest, zealous, and of great devotion, and a worthy preacher, came to Rome, who, in his preaching, rebuked the dissolute and lascivious looseness, incontinency, avarice, and immoderate pride of the clergy, provoking all to follow Christ and his apostles in their poverty rather, and in pureness of life. By reason whereof this man was well accepted, and highly liked of the nobility of Rome for a true disciple of Christ; but of the cardinals and the clergy he was no less hated than favoured of the other, insomuch that privily, in the night season, they took him and destroyed him. This his martyrdom, saith he, was revealed to him before from God by an angel, he being in the desert, when he was sent forth to preach; whereupon he said unto them publicly these words: “I know,” saith he, “ye seek my life, and know you will make away with me privily: but why? Because I preach to you the truth, and blame your pride, stoutness, avarice, incontinency, with your unmeasurable greediness in getting and heaping up of riches, therefore you be displeased with me. I take here heaven and earth to witness, that I have preached unto you that which I was commanded of the Lord. But you contemn me and your Creator, who by his only son hath redeemed you. And no marvel if you seek my death, being a sinful person, preaching unto you the truth, when if St. Peter were here this day and rebuked your vices, which do so multiply above all measure, you would not spare him neither.” And as he was expressing this, with a loud voice he said moreover: “For my part I am not afraid to suffer death for the truth’s sake; but this I say unto you, that God will look upon your iniquities, and will be revenged. You, being full of all impurity, play the blind guides to the people committed unto you, leading them the way to hell; a God he is of vengeance.” Thus the hatred of the clergy being incensed against him for preaching truth, they conspired against him, and so laying privy wait for him, took him and drowned him. Sabellicus and Platina say they hanged him.”

Now if after reading this fine story, we turn to Trithemius (as Fox correctly calls him), we shall find a plain tale which by no means warrants it, notwithstanding Fox’s assurance

that it is told “as it is set forth in Trithemius.” Perhaps his saying that he would “briefly in English express” it, might lead us to expect that he had abridged rather than embellished it. However it stands thus in Trithemius:—

“In those days, under Pope Honorius II., a certain priest and hermit, named Arnolphus, came to Rome, publicly declaring that the angel of the Lord had appeared to him when he was watching in his hermitage, and had commanded him to go and preach at Rome, and on God’s behalf confidently to rebuke the vices of the clergy. He came and preached, and began sharply to rebuke the pride, haughtiness, luxury, and avarice of the clergy, and especially the cardinals, and to exhort them to imitate the conversation of Christ and the Apostles. Who, when after having been forbidden, he would not give over preaching, being privately seized by night, was thrown into the Tiber and drowned.”*

This certainly is a poor foundation for Fox’s story; but is he responsible for any falsification? Certainly I do not mean to charge him with it. The only thing which seems to me to be wrong is that, instead of telling us where he got it, he quotes Trithemius directly. I do not doubt that he was translating from p. 1093 of the same book of Illyricus, which has been so often mentioned; and this the rather because Illyricus there professes to give the extract from Trithemius as something not before published.—“quando quidem id nondum opinor editum esse”—and whether he found it anywhere as he gave it, I cannot, of course, tell.

I hope it is not uncharitable to suspect that Fox was somewhat unwilling to name Illyricus too often, and render prominent a writer who had made himself so odious to most, and the most respectable, of the Protestants. He

* His temporibus sub Honorio Papa II. presbyter quidam, et eremita nomine Arnolphus Romam venit, dicens publice Angelum Domini apparuisse in eremitorio sibi vigilanti, ac præcepisse ut Romam prædicaturus adiens vitia clericorum ex parte Dei confidenter argueret. Venit, prædicavit, fastum, superbiam, luxum et avaritiam cleri, et maxime Cardinalium, acriter cœpit redarguere, et eos ad imitationem conversationis Christi, et apostolorum cohortari. Qui cum prohibitus prædicare non cessaret, nocte quadam occulte captus, in Tyberimque projectus suffocatur. *An.* 1128, Tom. I. p. 389.

certainly does mention him several times, but he is far from acknowledging all his obligations to him. We have seen a remarkable specimen of this in his History of the Waldenses, as well as in the extract from Trithemius just quoted; and I have no doubt that he was further indebted to Illyricus for what he has said about Arnulphus. If we compare what I have above extracted from Fox with the first account which Illyricus gives of Arnulphus in the paragraph of his catalogue, p. 644, beginning "Narrat Hugo, Platina et Sabellicus, Arnulphum quendam Archiepiscopum Lugdunensem, qui magna nominis celebritate, magnoque mortalium concursu divinam legem per Gallias, Italiam, et tandem Romæ prædicabat," &c., we shall scarcely doubt. There is, indeed, a curious difference, which is worth noticing on the subject of authorities;—Illyricus, in the first account, says, "*Hugo* quidem dicit captum et suspensum;" without telling us what the other two writers say on that subject. Fox says "*Sabellicus* and *Platina* say they hanged him,"—and so does Illyricus, in the second account above referred to, "*Sabellicus*, et *Platina*, suspensum affirmant." But really in unravelling such matters it is necessary now and then to look up, and look round, and rub one's eyes, and ask where one has got to. Here is a story about an Archbishop of Lyons who went on a missionary tour through France and Italy, and was martyred at Rome, though historians cannot exactly say—or rather modern writers cannot settle as to their testimony—whether he was hanged or drowned. What idea can people, who read such accounts with complacency, have of history? Do they suppose that there is no account of Lyons, or its Archbishops, or of the transactions of the time? If we were told that all this had happened to a priest named James, who was Archbishop of York in the reign of Queen Anne, we should turn to the list of Archbishops, and if we found that in her short reign, and even in the whole

series of Prelates, there was no Archbishop of York of that name, what should we think? Now it is quite as easy for people, who possess the facilities afforded by public libraries, and chuse to take the trouble, to see if there ever was an Arnulphus Archbishop of Lyons, and to learn who held that highly important station in the church during the very few years that Honorius II. was Pope. Humbald is not quite an unknown personage; and it is rather a singular coincidence that in the very year under which Trithemius gives this story of Arnulph, we find Bernard writing, “Reverendissimo Domino et Patri suo Humbaldo, Lugdunensi Archiepiscopo, *Romanæ Sedis Legato*,” on behalf of Burchard Bishop of Meaux. In fact, while this preaching is represented as having gone on, the Archbishop of Lyons was the Pope’s Legate, fighting his battle against the obstinate and impudent Abbot of Clugni, who had just set him at defiance, and sent him word that none but St. Peter in heaven could excommunicate him. But still the story of the martyred Archbishop is too good to be given up. It is printed and reprinted, vouched and revouched for, by writers on the Waldensian History. Leger gives the story with his characteristic ignorance and impudence; “Arnulphe aussi Archevêque de Lyon, [no doubt on that point] s’opposa avec tant de zele aus corruptions de la doctrine [Illyricus was content with practice] et du Clergé papal, qu’il en fut martirizé, comme le remarquent Platina, et Hugo Sabellicus, (*sic*) ‘Magno mortalium concursu divinam legem, per Italiam, Galliam, et tandem Romæ prædicans,’ prêchant la divine loy par toute l’Italie, et la France, et dans Rome mêmes avec une grande suite d’auditeurs, ayant esté pandu dans Rome par la rage du Clergé au tems du pape Honorius II. l’an 1062 (*sic*) Trithemius *parlant de cét Archevêque*, [even Illyricus does not pretend that Trithemius supposed the Archbishop of Lyons to have had anything to do with the matter]

au livre intitulé *Chronicum Hirsaugiense*, dit que ‘ du tems du Pape Honorius II. vint à Rome Arnulphus homme de grande pieté, et predicateur tres-excellent, qui prêchant la pure parole de Dieu, reprenoit hauetment l’ impureté, et les autres vices du Clergé, et recommandoit la simplicité, et sainteté Apostolique, si bien qu’ il fut admiré par la noblesse Romaine, comme un vray disciple de Jesus Christ, mais que les Cardinaux, et le Clergé le firent égorger de nuit, selon que luy même avoit predit son martyre.’ L’ Histoire en est décrite plus au long par Illyricus, en son Catalogue des vrais Temoins, a la page 1443.” *

* *Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudoises*. p. 152. Leger’s reference agrees with the fourth edition of *Illyricus*, of 1608. Of course we have in the present day lost all doubts whether Arnulphus was Archbishop of Lyons. He is an important person in modern Waldensian history. We see the successor of Irenæus, though in “a nominal connection” with the Church of Rome, come boldly down from his metropolitan throne to rebuke his apostate brother of Rome; and it opens to our view the state of things in “the south of France” in the twelfth century. Mr. Blair, who is one of the most ignorant and prolix of the modern writers on the History of the Waldenses, and whose work the Editor of the new edition of Fox is not ashamed to mention as an authority, tells the story thus:—“ Even in a nominal connection with the Church of Rome, there were some in the south of France, like Anselm at Milan, who opposed the Roman corruptions. Here Arnulph, Archbishop of Lyons, deserves to be mentioned, who opposed himself with so much zeal to the corruptions of the papal clergy *in doctrine* and life. Platina and *Hugo Sabellicus* remark, that he ‘preached the divine law through Italy and France, and lastly at Rome, with a great concourse of people.’ In the *Hirsuage* Chronicle, Trithemius writes, that ‘in the time of Pope Honorius II. Arnulph came to Rome, a man of great piety, and an excellent preacher, who, when preaching the pure word of God, boldly reprov’d the impurity and other vices of the clergy. He so much recommended apostolic simplicity and holiness, that he was admired by the nobles of Rome as a true disciple of Jesus Christ, but the cardinals and clergy caused *choke* him by night, (le firent égorger de nuit).’ Leger understands this as meaning, that he was hanged (pandu) at Rome, by the rage of his enemies. *Illyricus*, in his Catalogue, writes his biography at length.” Vol. I. p. 229. Such statements may surprise those who are not aware how the history of the persons set forth as “the line of witnesses” has been dealt with, from the days when *Illyricus* first published his Catalogue. That work contains some other very odd martyrs besides Arnulphus. For instance—among various paragraphs from Matthew Paris, *Illyricus* begins one—“Anno Domini 1179 puer quidam apud Vuadescoch martyrizatur. Concilium generale Romæ celebratur,” &c. p. 597. Certainly under that year Matthew Paris says “Puer

Another instance of the same kind is furnished by "the sentence of the Council of Brixia against Hildebrand." p. 133. Perhaps the reader will take my word that, so far as concerns Henry Mutius, the sentence is not thus expressed in the Abbot Urspergensis. The words "for he took away the marriage of priests, as Henry Mutius witnesseth," are, in the edition of 1583, enclosed in a parenthesis, which the Editor of the new edition has removed. That he observed the name is plain, for with that petty tampering which seems to have been his principal employment as Editor, he has turned Henricus into Henry, without attempting to translate the other half of the man's name, or testifying the least surprise at finding him in a decree of a Council held in 1080.* In fact the matter stands (parenthesis and all) in the work of Illyricus, so repeatedly referred to, p. 292.

quidam martyrizatus est apud Woodstocke;" but by whom was he martyred, and for what? Was it by the Jews, because he was a papist? What does it matter?

* Would it not have been more to the purpose to tell his readers who Henry Mutius was, if he could find any account of such a person? In like manner at p. 645, he gives a note on the sad story which Fox gives on the authority of Arpontacus Burdegalensis, without correcting or even noticing the barbarity of the reference. How it would surprise Joscaltiger to see his old schoolfellow thus introduced to the public of the nineteenth century, in one of the handsomest volumes which it has produced. Would he not think that the arts had outstripped the letters of our country? and is it not in fact lamentable that almost innumerable misprints, misnomers, and mistakes, should be thus amberized? There is nothing like any pretence of accurate reprinting to plead for this; on the contrary, the editor has altered, and (sometimes most unhappily) attempted to improve the text. This is not the place to enter into details on the subject, but I will add here what has been by some accident omitted at p. 22, where it should have stood as a note on the 12th article. It is only justice to Fox to say that he did not translate the article as it there stands. If the reader will only draw his pencil over *they hold*, in the second line, *are* in the fifth line, and *and* in the sixth line, he will have the article as it stands in the text of the edition of 1583. It will be obvious that the two latter interpolations alter the sense. We may ask when and by whom the Keys are to be given to Church, if they are not (as Fox's version implies) already given? and if this is not meant why is the alteration made?—again, the *and* put into the sixth line, makes the article state that it is the office of the Church to preach the word, whereas, the article really declares it to be the office of the Church to appoint pastors for that purpose. I give the editor full credit for

4. I feel it very difficult to say what is, or is not, unfair abridgement. I find that people differ very much on this point, and I believe that my ideas of honesty are different from those of the Editor of the *Christian Observer*. As to what he says about "*some historical critics,*" and "*certain cavillers,*" I do not know whether he means me; but if he does, I hope that he will, sometime or other, rise above that low stile of attack, and fairly tell me so; pointing out at the same time, clearly and distinctly, what it is that he finds fault with, and what there is which I impugn, which he is prepared to defend. I do not think that he will defend the omissions which I have shewn on the ground that they were fair abridgements, or indeed on any other ground.

There is, however, another species of abridgement, in which historians who have any party feeling (and how few histories have been written without it) are too apt to indulge, which seems to me to be unfair, and which, by the mere suppression of truth, amounts almost to the allegation of falsehood. It does not seem to me fair to tell (however truly) just that part of a story which suits one's own view of a disputed point, and to suppress the rest, if it has in the least degree a contrary bearing. I am not prepared to say to what extent Fox may have done this, for I have compared very few of his extracts with his authorities; and until the attempt was made to set him up as one who had made a searching scrutiny into parchment monuments about the Waldenses, I do not know that I had ever thought of looking out a reference. But I will mention an instance which then occurred, and which will illustrate my meaning. Fox says, in a paragraph immediately following that which I have before quoted about the Catini:—

believing that "in no single instance has he infringed upon the original intent and meaning of the author;" but he is mistaken in this, as he has sometimes been in supposing that he knew what the meaning of the author was.

“In like sort the Albigenses before mentioned, accounted also by the pope’s flock to be heretics, with their bishops, and a great number and company of them, were slain by commandment of Pope Gregory IX., at the same time in a certain place in Spain.” Ex Matth. Paris. fol. 87.

I do not know that there is anything here which can be said to be untrue. Perhaps it is not quite fair to represent them as slain by commandment of the Pope, as if some special order had been given in their case, while it does not appear that the Pope had ever heard of this particular business. Still they were slain by the Crusaders, to whom the Pope had given a general commission to suppress the Albigensian heresy, and it may be said that they were slain by commandment of the Pope. If there is anything like misrepresentation on this point, it arose, I believe, from Fox’s not taking time and trouble fully to understand what he was translating. But a more important question is, why were these unoffending Albigenses slaughtered? Of course, merely because they were accounted by the Pope’s flock to be heretics—why else are they put among the martyrs? Fox gives no authority but Matthew Paris, nor do I know that there is any; and how does he tell the story?

In this year, also, the Albigensian heretics in Spain, and that part of the country, so prevailed that, having ordained heretical bishops to preach their heresy, they boldly asserted that the Christian faith, and especially the mystery of the Incarnation, was a fond conceit, and to be altogether set aside. And collecting a numerous army, they entered the country of the Christians in a hostile manner, burning the churches, and slaughtering the Christians of either sex, and every age, without mercy. But this being at length made known, their heretical aggression was put down by the faithful Christians, who, at the command of Pope Gregory, had come as Crusaders from various parts of the West, for the defence of the Christian faith. In the spring the aforesaid heretics, with their bishops, were slain by them in a pitched battle, so that not one of them escaped. The Christians also taking possession of their cities, filled them with faithful Christians, and Catholic bishops having been ordained in them, the conquerors returned into their own country enriched and rejoicing.*

* “Hoc quoque anno hæretici Albigenses in partibus Hispaniæ et illis regionibus ita invaluerunt; ut ordinatis Episcopis hæreticis, qui suam prædicationem abusionem, asserebant constanter fidem Christianam et præcipue incarnationis mysterium, frivolum esse, ac penitus abrogandum. Et congregantes exercitum copiosum, ingressi sunt hostiliter fines Christianorum comburentes

Of course no man is bound to believe Matthew Paris, and it is quite open to every one to oppose his statements, either by argument, or by testimony—but this is his account of the matter; and is it not somewhat different from what a reader of Fox would have imagined?

I know that each case of misstatement exposed may, by itself, seem trifling, and that the exposure leads to a great deal of tiresome petty criticism. It is easy to represent this as cavilling, and making much of trifles, (though that is, I believe, only done by those who are conscious that they cannot make any answer to the details) but the fact is, that it is only by a continual succession and reproduction of little suppressions, and omissions, and alterations, in ancient testimonies, that the popular delusion about the Waldenses and Albigenses is kept up. Some of these I have exposed, and more I hope to expose, being convinced that one of the most likely ways to lead men to sound and really useful knowledge respecting the History of the Church of Christ, is to shew them how grossly they are imposed on by popular statements.

ecclesias, et homines Christianos cujuscunque sexus vel ætatis immisericorditer trucidantes. Sed hoc tandem divulgato, compressa est eorum superstitiosa præsumptio a fidelibus Christianis; qui ad mandatum Gregorii Papæ ex diversis regionibus Occidentis cruce signati advenerant ad defensionem fidei Christianæ. Perempti sunt autem ab eis in campestri prælio, tempore vernali cum suis Episcopis hæretici memorati; ita quod nec unus eorum evasit. Christiani quoque civitates eorum occupantes, repleverunt eas fidelibus Christianis; et ordinatis in eis Episcopis Catholicis, reversi sunt in patriam victores, ditati ac lætabundi. An. 1234. Vol. 1. p. 395.

By the same Author.

AN ENQUIRY into the grounds on which the PROPHETIC PERIOD of DANIEL and ST. JOHN has been supposed to consist of 1260 Years. 8vo. 3s.

A Second ENQUIRY on the same subject, containing an examination of the Arguments of Mede—Remarks on a Passage in the Dialogues on Prophecy—On Reviews of the First Enquiry in the “Christian Observer,” “Christian Examiner,” and “Christian Guardian,”—and on the common interpretation of the seven heads of the Beasts. 8vo. 6s.

AN ATTEMPT to ELUCIDATE the PROPHECIES concerning ANTICHRIST. 8vo. 1s.

THE 1260 DAYS, in Reply to a Review in the “Morning Watch.” 8vo. 1s.

A LETTER to the Rev. W. DIGBY, A.M., occasioned by his “Treatise on the 1260 Days.” 8vo. 2s.

FACTS and DOCUMENTS illustrative of the History, Doctrine, and Rites of the ancient ALBIGENSES and WALDENSES. 8vo. 16s.

THE TRANSLATION of BISHOPS. 8vo. 1s.

THE 1260 DAYS, in Reply to the “STRICTURES” of WILLIAM CUNINGHAME, Esq., of Lainshaw, in the County of Ayr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM. A new edition. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

A LETTER to the Rev. Hugh JAMES ROSE, Chaplain to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury; with STRICTURES on MILNER'S CHURCH HISTORY. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

A SECOND LETTER to the Rev. HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D., containing NOTES on MILNER'S HISTORY of the CHURCH in the FOURTH CENTURY. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A LETTER to the Rev. JOHN KING, M.A., Incumbent of Christ's Church, Hull; occasioned by HIS PAMPHLET entitled “Maitland not authorized to censure Milner.” 8vo. 2s. 6d.

REMARKS on that part of the Rev. J. KING'S PAMPHLET entitled “Maitland not authorized to censure Milner,” which relates to the WALDENSES, including a reply to the Rev. G. S. FABER'S SUPPLEMENT, entitled “Reinerius and Maitland.” 8vo. 2s. 6d.

GLOUCESTER:

PRINTED BY LEWIS BRYANT, WESTGATE STREET.



U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C065174165

