

CHAPTER VI.

THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE CASE OF PETER DE BRUIS AND HENRY.

BUT, whatever direct connection may have subsisted between Berenger and the Cathari, there can be no rational doubt, that Peter de Bruis and his disciple Henry were two of the most eminent among their ministers. Under that aspect, accordingly, they are viewed by Bossuet: and thence, as a necessary part of his system, they are of course to be convicted of Manichæism*. Such being the case, an exculpation of these two individuals is an exculpation of the Cathari.

A more complete failure than the attempt of Bossuet, I have rarely encountered. Yet, save the malignity of the intention, it may well be excused. The Bishop, in truth, had little to work upon: and that little was, either nothing to the purpose, or directly adverse to his theory. So zealous were the Inquisitors in destroying the

* Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. xi. § 65—69.

writings of Bruis and Henry, that we scarcely know any thing of their tenets save what we can learn from the Tractate or Epistle of an Abbot of Clugny, Peter the Venerable, addressed to the Archbishops of Arles and Embrun with other Prelates of Dauphiny and Provence. In point of quantity, this Work is, indeed, most abundantly verbose and prolix: but its quality and texture are such, that, to deduce from it any proof of the Manichæism of the alleged heretics, could only, I think, have been gravely attempted by an Ecclesiastic of the Romish persuasion.

I. In the first quarter of the twelfth century, Peter de Bruis laboured, throughout Dauphiny and Provence and Languedoc and Gascony, during a term of nearly twenty years*. At length,

* Dominis et Patribus, Magistris Ecclesie Dei, Arelatensi, Ebredunensi, Archiepiscopis; Diensi et Wapicensi Episcopis; Frater Petrus humilis Cluniacensis Abbas, salutem et obsequium.

Scripsi nuper epistolam reverentie vestre, contra hæreses Petri de Bruis disputantem: sed, innumeris et magnis negotiis, a dictando animum, a scribendo stylum, retardentibus, huc usque mittere distuli. Mitto nunc tandem eam prudentie vestre, ut, per vos, hæreticis contra quos scripta est, et etiam Catholicis quibus forsitan prodesset poterit, innotescat. Vobis etiam mitto, quoniam, in partibus vestris aut circa easdem, stulta illa et impia hæresis, more pestis validæ, multos interfecit, plures infecit. Sed, gratia Dei concitante et adjuvante studia vestra, a vestris regionibus sese paululum removit. Migravit tamen, sicut audivi, ad loca satis vobis contigua: et,

he was seized by his watchful enemies: and, in the year 1126, was committed to the flames in the town of St. Giles. After his death, Henry ministered in the same tract of country: and, in the year 1147, he also was either burned alive at Toulouse, or (as some statements say) ended his days in prison.

Now, from the Tractate of the Abbot of Clugny, Bossuet trusts, that he shall be able to establish the Manichæism of Bruis and Henry, and thence, by a necessary consequence, the Manichæism of the Albigenses.

For the giving a correct account of the doctrinal system maintained by these two individuals, the admirable qualifications of Peter the Venerable

a Septimania vestra, vobis persequentibus, expulsa, in provincia Novempopulana, quæ vulgo Gasconia vocatur, et in partibus ei adjacentibus, sibi foveas præparavit: in quibus nunc se timore occultans, nunc de ipsis audacia assumpta prodians, quos potest decipit, quos potest corrumpit; et, nunc istis, nunc illis, lethalia venena propinat. Vestrum est, igitur, ad quos præcipue, tam ex officio, quam ex singulari scientia, in partibus illis cura Ecclesie Dei spectat, et quibus ipsa velut fortibus columnis maxime innititur: vestrum est, inquam, et, a locis illis in quibus se latibula invenisse gaudet, et prædicatione, et etiam (si necesse fuerit) vi armata per Laicos, exturbare.—Et, quia prima erronei dogmatis semina, a Petro de Bruis per viginti fere annos sata et aucta, quinque præcipua et venenata virgulta produxerunt: contra illa maxime, ut potui, egi. Petr. Cluniac. Tract. contra Petrobrusian. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. xii. par. post. p. 206.

are sufficiently clear from his own free acknowledgments.

He wrote, as he himself distinctly tells us, from mere vulgar unauthenticated rumour.

Let us see, whether these heretics, who yield not to the authority of the great doctors of the Church, will at least acquiesce in the decision of either Christ or the Prophets or the Apostles. I say this, because common report has spread it abroad, that you do not totally believe either the Prophets or the Apostles or even Christ himself: and the same report, if it be true, indicates moreover, that you detract from the majesty both of the Old Testament and of the New Testament. But, because I ought not to give assent to the fallaciousness of mere rumours, more especially when some affirm that you have rejected the whole of the Sacred Canon, while others contend that you receive some portions of it, I am unwilling to censure you for matters uncertain*.

* Quia sanctis Ecclesie doctoribus fidem præbere dedignamini, ad purissimum rivulorum omnium fontem mihi est reverendum: et, de Evangelicis, Apostolicis, seu Prophetis, dictis, testimoniis, si tamen vel ista suscipitis, sunt proferenda. Videndum est, utrum hi, qui tantis orbis terrarum magistris non cedant, saltem Christo, Prophetis, vel Apostolis, acquiescant. Hoc ideo dico, quoniam, nec ipsi Christo, vel Prophetis, aut Apostolis, vos ex toto credere, fama vulgavit: ipsisque majestati Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, quæ jam ab antiquo totum orbem subdidit, vos detrudere, si tamen verum est, indicavit. Sed, quia fallaci rumorum monstro non facile assensum præbere

He had furthermore, as he likewise informs us, consulted a Work, which was said to have been dictated to an amanuensis by Henry, the disciple and successor of Bruis: but he himself, nevertheless, did not venture to adduce it as affording any safe warrant for a regular accusation.

After the burning of Peter de Bruis at St. Giles; whereby, through the zeal of the faithful, he passed from temporal to eternal fire, Henry, the heir of his wickedness, with I know not what other persons, did not so much amend as alter his diabolical doctrine: for, as I lately saw in a volume which was said to have been written from his dictation, he put forth, not merely five points, like his master, but many points. Nevertheless, because I have not as yet full confidence, that he either so thinks or so preaches, I defer my answer to him in particular, until I shall have indisputable certainty of the matters which are reported concerning him.*

debeo, maxime cum quidam vos totum divinum Canonem abjecisse affirmant, alii quædam ex ipso vos suscepisse contendunt, culpæ vos de incertis nolo; sed necessario totum Canonem, qui ab Ecclesiâ suscipitur, vos suscipere debere, certis auctoritatibus probo. Petr. Cluniac. Tract. cont. Petrobrus. p. 209.

* Post rogum Petri de Bruis, quo, apud Sanctum Ægidium, zelus fidelium, flammæ dominicæ crucis ab eo successas, eum concremando, ultus est; postquam planè impius ille, de igne ad ignem, de transeunte ad æternum, transitum fecit: hæres nequitie ejus Heinricus, cum nescio quibus aliis, doctrinam diabolicam non quidem emendavit, sed immutavit; et, sicut

And, in truth, very well he performs his task. But how this perfectly conclusive argument against one of the recognised tenets of Manichæism is to fix the charge of Manichæism itself upon persons whom Peter all the while confessedly knew not to hold any such tenet, certainly passes my comprehension. The reasoning is very good reasoning in its place: but, so far as Bruis and his disciples are concerned, it is plainly, according to the Abbot's own statement of the matter, quite irrelevant.

II. Descending, however, to greater particularity, for the purpose of indisputably establishing his accusation, he sums up, in five points, the principal doctrines, which, during the space of well nigh twenty years, were said to have been preached by the indefatigable heresiarch.

The first point denies: that children, who have not arrived at the age of intellect, can be saved by Christian Baptism; or that the faith of another person can be profitable to those, who are physically unable to exert any faith of their own. For, according to them, it is not the faith of another, but an individual's own faith, which saves with Baptism: inasmuch as the Lord says; He, that believeth and is baptised, shall be saved; and he, that believeth not, shall be damned.*

* Christi baptismate. The meaning of this expression, I suppose, must be, not the baptism which Christ himself submitted to, but the baptism which he ordained to be received by others.

The honesty, while he attacks the two heretics, evinced by Peter of Clugny, in duly telling us, that, save by hearsay, he really knows nothing about them, is doubtless laudable as far as it goes: yet, assuredly, if acknowledged ignorance and uncertainty be valuable requisites in a trustworthy witness, we have them exhibited in the highest perfection by this specially Venerable Abbot.

After thus very handsomely confessing that he was entirely in the dark, as to whether the Petrobrusians did or did not receive either the whole or any part of the Canon of Scripture, he sets himself to demonstrate, that an admission of the New Testament inevitably involves and draws after it an admission of the Old Testament*.

nuper in tomo, qui ab ore ejus exceptus dicebatur, non quinque tantum, sed plura, capitula edidit. Contra quæ animus accenditur rursus agere, et verbis dæmoniacis, divinis sermonibus, obviare. Sed, quia cum ita sentire vel prædicare nondum mihi plenè fides facta est, differo responsionem, quousque et horum, quæ dicuntur, indubium habeam certitudinem. Petr. Cluniac. Tract. cont. Petrobrus. p. 207.

* Si enim, quod omnes affirmant, Evangelium etiam tantum suscipitis; necessario, ut dictum est, et reliqua omnia suscipietis. Nec enim potest Evangelio credere, et de his, quæ idem Evangelium suscipit, dubitare. Petr. Cluniac. cont. Petrobrus. p. 209.

Evangelium toti Veteri Instrumento testimonium dat: et, ejus insuper auctoritatibus, ea ipsa, quæ prædicat, confirmat. Ibid. p. 212.

The second point maintains: that churches ought not to be built, and that those already built ought to be pulled down. For sacred places, set apart for prayer, are no way necessary to Christians: inasmuch as God, whether invoked in a tavern or in a church, in a market-place or in a temple, before an altar or before a manger, equally hears and answers those who are deserving.*

* The Abbot's statement of this point is evidently a mere perversion of a very just allegation on the part of his opponents.

The gross superstition of the day was not content with the decent setting apart of a new church to the worship of God: but, furthermore, enriched or encumbered it with the fictitious relics of saints and martyrs; attributed to it a sort of mysterious geographical sanctity, quite apart from the spirituality of any service actually performing within its walls; and, in the current phraseology of the age, spake of it, as the *Locus Benedictus Cluniacensis* or the *Locus Benedictus Clarovalensis*.

Arguing against this gross and mischievous superstition, the more evangelically enlightened Petrobrusians, I suppose, urged the words of our Lord to the woman of Samaria: *The hour cometh, when, neither in this mount nor yet at Jerusalem, ye shall worship the Father;—but the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.*

Throughout his long defence of good substantial churches of stone and timber, the Venerable Peter, as usual, is combating a demon of his own evocation. That the Petrobrusians were for pulling down all the churches in the country and having no churches whatsoever, was purely a matter of ignorant blundering hearsay. The very mode, in which the figment is told, shews us how it originated.

Ecclesiam Dei unitate fidelium congregatorum constare, et

The third point commands: that sacred crucifixes should be broken and burned. For the cross, on which Christ was so horribly tortured and so cruelly slain, is worthy neither of adoration nor of veneration nor of any suppliant invocation: but rather, by way of avenging his torments and death, it ought to be treated with every dishonour, to be hacked with swords, to be burned with fire.

The fourth point not only denies the truth of the

vos, ut audio, dicitis, et omnibus clarum est: *locorum autem sacrarum adificia fieri non debere, et facta subruere oportere, vos quidem affirmatis; sed nos, toto mundo nobis adjuncto, contradicimus.* Petr. Cluniac. cont. Petrobrus. p. 220.

The persecuted heretics, who were relentlessly harried by the orthodox from Dauphiny to Gascony greatly to the delight of the holy Abbot, would, I doubt not, like men of plain common sense, have been very glad to have had comfortable churches of their own, if their popish enemies would have permitted them. But such was not the case: and hence they were fain to worship their God, in dens and caves of the earth, or in stables, or anywhere else where they could conceal themselves. Under these circumstances, it is rather too much, that their very *latebræ*, their unwilling *latebræ*, should be made a matter of reproach to them, by the two well-housed Abbots of Clugny and Clairvaux.

Sibi foveas preparavit, says Peter: in quibus nunc se timore occultat, nunc de ipsis, audacia assumpta, prodit. Petr. Cluniac. cont. Petrobrus. p. 206.

Ubi apostolica forma et vita, rejoins Bernard addressing the poor sufferers, quam jactatis? Illi clamant: vos susurratis. Illi in publico: vos in angulo. Illi, ut nubes, volant: vos in tenebris ac subterraneis domibus, delitescitis. Bernard. super Cant. serm. lxxv. Oper. col. 760.

Unluckily, Bernard seems not to have recollected the pa-

body and blood of the Lord, through the sacrament daily and continually offered up in the Church: but it also declares, that that sacrament is nothing, and that it ought not to be offered up to God.

The fifth point derides sacrifices, prayers, alms, and other good deeds, when made by the living faithful on behalf of the faithful defunct: affirming, that, not even in the smallest degree, can they help any one of the dead.*

thetic eloquence of one of those very Apostles, whom he would place in such strong contradistinction to the afflicted Albigenes.

St. Paul would not have despised their *foveæ* and *tenebræ* and *domus subterraneæ*. Nay, since he actually lauds those, who wandered about in *sheep-skins* and in *goat-skins*, being destitute, afflicted, tormented: it may fairly be doubted, whether he would have fully entered into the spirit of Bernard's *Vile nempe hoc genus et rusticum ac sine literis et prorsus imbelles.* Ibid. col. 762.

Fiat experimentum in corpore vili: said the learned physician to his attendant surgeon. *Nullum corpus est tam vile,* replied the supposed illiterate patient, *pro quo Christus non est dedignatus mori.*

We all know St. Paul's unrivalled parenthesis: *Of whom the world is not worthy.*

* Primum hæreticorum capitulum negat, parvulos, infra intelligibilem ætatem constitutos, Christi Baptismate posse salvari: nec alienam fidem posse illis prodesse, qui sua uti non possunt: quoniam, juxta eos, non aliena fides, sed propria, cum baptismo salvat, Domino dicente: *Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit; qui vero non crediderit, condemnabitur.*

Secundum capitulum dicit, templorum vel ecclesiarum fabricam fieri non debere, factas insuper subruere oportere: nec esse

Here, in due form, as preferred by Peter the Venerable against Bruis and his disciples, we have, with whatever distortion of statement, five specific articles of indictment. Now, even if we unreservedly take them as they stand, I should be glad to learn, from any modern follower of Bossuet, where it is that they exhibit the slightest shade of doctrinal Manichæism.

III. But, in vindication of Bruis and his disciples, merely negative evidence is by no means the whole that may be urged: we have also a sufficiency of positive evidence.

By the Manichæans, the outward administration of Baptism was altogether rejected: whence, in

necessaria Christianis sacra loca ad orandum; quoniam æquè, in taberna et in ecclesia, in foro et in templo, ante altare vel ante stabulum, invocatus Deus audit, et eos qui merentur exaudit.

Tertium capitulum, cruces sacras confringi, præcipit, et succendi: quia species illa vel instrumentum, quo Christus tam dirè tortus, tam crudeliter occisus, est, non adoratione, non veneratione, vel aliqua supplicatione, digna est; sed, ad ultionem tormentorum et mortis ejus, omni dedecore debonestanda, gladiis concidenda, ignibus succidenda, est.

Quartum capitulum non solum veritatem corporis et sanguinis Domini, quotidie et continuè per sacramentum in Ecclesia oblatum, negat: sed, omnino illud nihil esse, neque Deo offerri debere, decernit.

Quintum capitulum, sacrificia, orationes, eleemosynas, et reliqua bona, pro defunctis fidelibus, a vivis fidelibus facta, deridet: nec, ea aliquem mortuorum, vel in modico, posse juvari, affirmat. Petr. Cluniac. cont. Petrobrus. p. 206, 207.

the writings of popish ecclesiastics, a renunciation of this sacrament is perpetually alleged against those pretended heretics, upon whom they would invidiously fix the charge of Manichæism. But, according to the Abbot, bitter and prejudiced as he was, the Petrobrusians were only a sort of Antipedobaptists, who rejected not *Baptism itself*, but who simply denied the utility of *Infant-Baptism*. Judging from the language which they are reported to have held on that topic, I am myself satisfied: that they did nothing more than deny the spiritual grace of Regeneration to follow, *ex opere operato*, the outward administration of the material sign in Baptism; and that this was misconstrued into an assertion, that infants ought not to be baptised, inasmuch as infants cannot, by any proper faith of their own, be worthy recipients*. But, however that may be, the question, *Whether Infant-Baptism was really rejected by them*, is, in truth, so far as any testimony to their fancied Manichæism is concerned, quite wide of the mark. Let them have rejected, or let them have retained, *Infant-Baptism specifically*: still they confessedly held the observance, and even insisted upon the necessity, of the sacrament of *Baptism itself*. Now this they could not have

* Dixistis: Nec Baptismus, sine propria fide; nec propria fides, sine baptismo; aliquid potuit. Neutrum enim, sine altero, salvat. Petr. Cluniac. cont. Petrobrus. p. 217.

done, if they had been votaries of the Manichæan Heresy.

So likewise the very mode, in which (according to the Abbot) the Petrobrusians shewed their zeal for the destruction of crucifixes, and respecting which Bossuet is profoundly silent, yet again demonstrates the impossibility of their having been Manichæans. On a certain Good-Friday, they collected together as many crosses as they could : and, using them as the materials for a large fire which they kindled, they proceeded to roast a quantity of flesh meat, from which they afterward made a hearty meal, inviting the people to follow their example*. In such an action, they might perhaps have shewn more of iconoclastic zeal than of sober discretion : but, at all events, the narrative effectually confutes the charge of Manichæism. For, among the various badges of the disciples of Manès, one, it is well known, was

* *Prævenistis scelestis operibus celeritatem verborum : et, profundis in religionem odiis, quod vel cogitare scelus fuerat, insigne nostræ fidei tollere attentastis. Quod tunc factum est, quando, ad inauditam Divinitatis contumeliam, magno de crucibus aggere instructo, ignem immisitistis, pyram fecistis, carnes coxistis, et, ipso passionis dominicæ die paschalem dominicam præcedente, invitatis publicè ad talem esum populis, comedistis. Petr. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 222.*

In spirit, the action was the very same as that of Hezekiah when he brake in pieces the brazen serpent which the Israelites had began idolatrously to fumigate with incense : the same also as that of Epiphanius, when, at Anablatha, he indignantly rent

an abhorrence of animal food, on the ground that it was the special production of the Evil Principle : whereas Bruis and his followers, instead of being haunted by any such absurd scruples, shewed their contempt both of purely mechanical fasting and of idolatrously worshipped crucifixes, by feeding strenuously upon flesh meat cooked on Good-Friday at a fire made of the timber of crosses.

There is also another matter, which, even still more definitely, brings us to the same conclusion. The Manichæans, like the old Docetæ, denied that Christ had any proper material body ; the form, which was seen, having been purely phantasiastic : whence, they also consistently denied, that he endured upon the cross any real sufferings. Accordingly, *a denegation of Christ's substantial body*, is, by the romish ecclesiastics, perpetually charged upon those, whom they would convict of Manichæism. But the Petrobrusians, so far from deny-

the veil on which was represented the image of some saint or per- adventure of Christ himself : the same also as that of holy Serenus of Marseilles, who, in the time of Pope Gregory I, brake in pieces the contemptible puppets, from the insensate worship of which he was unable to restrain the people. Strong cases require strong remedies : and strong remedies (though, after all, mere senseless pieces of wood were burned, because they were wickedly abused) will always move the indignation of idolatrous bigots. *Ye have taken away my gods which I made : and what have I more?* has been the piteous complaint and angry question of more than Micah of Mount Ephraim.

ing that Christ had a material body, are actually said to have alleged, in their third point of doctrine, that it was the height of absurdity to adore the instrument on which the Lord was so horribly tortured and so cruelly put to death. Hence, assuredly, according to the testimony of their very enemies, Bruis and his disciples could, by no possibility, have been Manichæans.

IV. Still, however, though with these three several facts before his eyes, the Bishop of Meaux does not altogether despair. Advancing, it seems, a step beyond Berenger, the Petrobrusians not only denied the truth of the body and blood of Christ, but likewise the sacrament itself with its species and figure : thus leaving the people without any sacrifice of the most high and true God*.

* *Si hæresis hæc vestra Berengariis limitibus contenta esset, quæ veritatem quidem corporis Christi, sed non sacramentum vel speciem aut figuram, negabat : facile me hujus capituli labore expedirem. — Isti, inquam, libri, vos et corrigere, et ad recipiendum cogere, possent, si nihil deterius Berengarianis Hæreticis sentiretis. Sed, quia, ut dixi, errorem errorem, hæresim hæresi, nequitiam nequitia, superastis : non tantum veritatem carnis et sanguinis Christi, sed et sacramentum, speciem, ac figuram, negatis ; et sic, absque summi et veri Dei sacrificio, ejus populum esse censetis. Petr. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 228.*

What Peter means, by saying, that the heretics went beyond Berenger himself, it is not easy to determine. But, from his making the excess to consist in so defining the species and figure of the sacrament as to leave the people without any sacrifice of the true God ; which, therefore, implies, that Berenger, though he denied the substantial presence, did not

Hence the Bishop rapidly pronounces them to be clearly convicted Manichæans, because, like the Manichæans, they absolutely rejected the Eucharist*.

It is really very difficult to believe, that Bossuet could have *honestly* penned such a charge on such grounds. Why, the very language of Peter the Venerable is so perfectly intelligible, that he, who runs, may read. What Bruis and his disciples

altogether reject the idea of a sacrifice : I am inclined to think, that the difference was this. Berenger, like Justin and Irenæus, was willing to deem the elements, when presented upon the table, to be a *sort* of sacrifice or oblation to God of the first-fruits of the earth. Justin. Mart. Apol. i. Oper. p. 76, 77. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 269, 270. Iren. adv. hæres. lib. iv. c. 32. p. 261. Bruis, finding this concession abused to the establishment of the utterly unscriptural sacrifice of the Mass, roundly, and very truly, denied the existence of any sacrifice in the Eucharist, according to the sense imposed upon the term by the Romanists. The declamatory rhapsodies of that violent and confessedly half-informed writer Peter of Clugny are built, I believe, upon the truth : but no sober person, I suppose, would care to swallow them undiluted and unanalysed.

* *Ce n'est pas nier seulement la vérité du corps et du sang ; mais, comme les Manichéens, rejeter absolument l'Eucharistie. Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. xi. § 66.*

Whenever it suits his purpose, the Bishop either devoutly believes, or at least affects devoutly to believe, all that Peter the Venerable is pleased to tell him : but, when the Abbot un- luckily says anything incompatible with the hypothesis of Petrobrusian Manichæism ; then the wise practice of Bossuet is the *Prudens prætereo*.

rejected was, most evidently, not the *due administration of the Eucharist*, but its miserable perversion by the Church of Rome. They denied not broadly the truth of the body and blood of Christ; for they acknowledged, that he had a real substantial body which suffered upon the cross: but they denied the truth of any material presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist; rationally and scripturally asserting, that the process, whereby the priests claimed to make the body and blood of Christ at the altar, was a piece of useless folly. And, in like manner, they denied not the sacrifice of Christ, which he once for all offered upon the cross: but they rejected the worse than idle notion, that the Eucharist, in species and figure, is a sacrifice of the literal body and blood of Christ, offered up whensoever Mass is celebrated by a priest*. Whatever Peter may mean by asserting, in his loose declamatory style, that Bruis went beyond Berenger: it is quite certain, from his own words, as quoted by Bossuet himself, that such, and nothing more, was the reputed heresy of the Petrobrusians in

* Negat corpus Christi et sanguinem, divini verbi virtute, vel sacerdotum ministerio, confici: totumque inane ac super vacuum esse, quicquid, in altaris sacramento, altaris ministri agere videntur, affirmat. Petr. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 228.

Sacramentum speciem ac figuram negatis: et sic, absque summi et veri Dei sacrificio, ejus populum esse censetis. Ibid. p. 228.

N 2

Christ was once for all offered up on the cross: whence they argued; that A priest could not make it upon the altar, in order that it might be repeatedly a sacrifice for sin.

Their own language to the people, indeed, even as reported by the Abbot, is incompatible with the notion of their being Manichæans: for, in that very language, they are made professedly to acknowledge the true substantial existence of the human body of Christ.

V. That the entire matter may be still further cleared, I shall give the Abbot's own construction of the five doctrinal points ascribed to the Petrobrusians; together with a sixth point, in itself of secondary importance, and to the main question of no importance whatsoever.

Ye say: that neither baptism without concomitant faith, nor faith without concomitant baptism, is of any avail; for neither can save without the other*.

Ye preach: that churches are vainly built; since the Church of God consists, not in a mass of coherent stones, but in the unity of the congregated faithful.

Ye say: that the cross of the Lord is not to be honoured or adored; for the instrument of Christ's torment and death ought to be rejected, not venerated.

* Dixistis: Nec baptismus, sine propria fide; nec propria fides, sine baptismo: aliquid potuit. Petr. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 217.

regard to the Eucharist; for he represents their doctrine, concerning the ministration of a popish priest at the altar, as one which left the people without any sacrifice of the most high and true God; that is to say (for thus the whole context imports), as one which left the people without any daily sacrifice of the Mass.

In truth, the very phraseology which the blundering Abbot puts into their mouths, absurd and incongruous as it is, so utterly destroys the fancy of their being Manichæans, that Bossuet, more prudently than equitably, has not, any more than their fourth and fifth points of doctrine, ventured to adduce it.

According to Peter de Clugny, they were wont to say to the people: *Be not deceived by the priests, who would persuade you that they can make the body of Christ upon the altar; whereas the body of Christ was made once only, by Christ himself, at the last supper* *.

What they really said, was; that *The body of*

* Verba vestra, quæ ad nos pervenire potuerunt, ista sunt. Nolite, O populi, Episcopis, Presbyteris, seu Clero vos seducere, credere: qui, sicut in multis, sic et in altaris officio, vos decipiunt; ubi, corpus Christi se conficere, et vobis ad vestrarum animarum salutem se tradere, mentiuntur. Mentuntur plane. Corpus enim Christi semel tantum, ab ipso Christo, in cœna ante passionem, factum est: et semel, hoc est, tunc tantum, discipulis datum est. Exinde, neque confectum ab aliquo, neque alicui datum, est. Petr. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 228.

rated; ought to be burned, not (more insensible matter as it is) to be invoked by silly prayers.

Ye assert: that the Church possesses not the body of the Lord, in the sacrament of the altar; and that, whatsoever is there done by the priests, is idle and without true effect, since Christ gave his body, not to future Christians, but once alone to his then present disciples.

Ye affirm: that it is in vain to pray or to do any good deed for the defunct; because the good deeds of the living cannot profit those, who, when they departed hence, took with them their whole stock of merit, to which nothing can be contributed by another.

Ye add: that by ecclesiastical chaunts, God is only mocked; since he, who is delighted with holy affections alone can neither be propitiated by loud voices, nor soothed by the artificial modulations of scientific music*.

* Prædicatis enim templa superfluo fabricari: cum Ecclesia Dei non constet multitudine sibi coherentium lapidum, sed unitate congregatorum fidelium.

Dicitis, crucem Domini honorandam vel adorandam non esse: quoniam species, quæ dominicorum cruciatuum et mortis instrumentum fuit, abjicienda, non veneranda; ignibus concremanda, non stultis supplicationibus res insensibilis invocanda est.

Asseritis, corpus Domini, in sacramento altaris, Ecclesiam non habere, et quicquid in eo a sacerdotibus fit, inane prorsus et absque aliquo veritatis effectu: quoniam Christus, non futuris Christianis semper, sed presentibus tantum discipulis, illud semel dedit.

and the Henricians and the Albigenes*. In truth, the Petrobrusians and the Henricians, as Bossuet himself well knows or rather insists, were but the Albigenes under different names. Consequently, when *their* doctrinal system is ascertained, that of the Albigenes is ascertained also†.

VI. At a later period, as I have already stated, the disciple Henry either died in confinement or encountered the same fate as his sainted master Bruis. Let us hope, that the former was the case. It has been said, however, that, after a

* Genebrard. Chronol. apud Alix on the Albig. chap. xviii. p. 196.

† From the language of the Abbot Peter, we may gather, that, at this time, even some good Catholics, most probably from their converse with the heretical Albigenes, entertained doubts in no wise satisfactory to their ghostly teachers, respecting both the worship of the cross and the efficacy of any good deeds of the living to profit the dead.

Cum ergo, irrefragabili auctoritate et invicta ratione, honoranda, collaudanda, glorificanda, crux Christi a Christianis esse probetur: quod et adorari debeat, sicut a quibusdam hæreticis negatur; sic, utrum fieri debeat, a quibusdam Catholicis quaeritur. Petr. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 226.

Quod bona vivorum mortuis prodesse valeant, et hi hæretici negant, et quidam etiam Catholici dubitare videntur. Ibid. p. 240.

Those acknowledgments are very curious. Notwithstanding Peter's logical arguments in favour of idolatry and human meritoriousness, with which he himself at least is evidently quite satisfied, the heaven continued to ferment through all the middle ages until the mass was sufficiently prepared for the glorious Reformation of the sixteenth century.

cess; that churches were left without congregations; congregations, without priests; priests, without reverence; and Christians, without Christ. The sanctuary of God was denied to be holy: churches were deemed no better than synagogues: sacraments were no longer sacred: festivals were deprived of their solemn festivities. By death, souls were hurried before the terrific tribunal of God: neither, alas, reconciled by penance, nor fortified by the viaticum of the Holy Communion. Children were shut out from the life of Christ, while the regenerative grace of Baptism was denied to be their property*.

Surely, concludes the zealous Bernard to his noble friend Count Ildefonso of St. Giles: *Surely, this man cannot be of God, who says and does things so contrary to God. Nevertheless, alas, alas, he is heard by multitudes: and he has a people, who give implicit confidence to him. By some strange diabo-*

* Parvulis Christianorum Christi intercluditur vita, dum baptismi negatur gratia: nec salutis propinquare sinuntur.

In the text, I have expressed what I believe to have been the doctrine really taught by Henry. He denied, I suppose, that the inward grace of regeneration always, in the case of infants, attends upon the administration of the outward and visible sign in baptism. This was construed into a denial of baptism itself to infants. Bernard, accurately enough, reported the true doctrine of Henry in the words, *Baptismi negatur GRATIA*; Henry himself, by the term *gratia*, meaning the inward grace of Baptism: but I do not think, that Bernard so understood the phrasology which he reported.

painful life incessantly devoted to ministerial and missionary exertions, he was, in the year 1147, consigned to the flames at Toulouse, by the barbarity of the Papal Legate Alberic, and at the unchristian solicitation of Bernard of Clairvaux.

Be that as it may, this last individual, relentlessly, even after death, pursued the reformer with the foulest and yet most inconsistent calumnies: for, while he represents him as a very monster, he is compelled to acknowledge the wide success of his indefatigably conducted labours. Henry travelled, indeed, throughout the whole of Languedoc and Gascony, a convicted wolf in sheep's clothing: he apostatically threw off the habit of his Order, for he had originally been a monk; and, as a dog returns to his vomit, greedily returned to the world and the uncleanness of the flesh: he sold the word of God; and preached, what he called the Gospel, for a livelihood: he was a gamester, an habitual fornicator, and, by way of variety, an occasional adulterer: wherever he journeyed, whether from Lausanne or from Poictou or from Bourdeaux, he left behind him the slimy traces of his filthiness: yea, the very land, wherein for a season he took up his abode, stank awfully with the stupendous fetidness of his evil odour. Yet, when he girt up his loins; and, knowing not whither he went, became a wanderer upon the face of God's earth: such, with a plainly besotted people, was his paradoxical suc-

cal art, he has bewitched the silly vulgar: so that they believe not even their own eye-sight. He has made them fancy: that all are in error; that the whole world is in the high-road to ruin; and that all the riches of the mercy of God, and the entire grace which belongs to the whole human kind, appertain exclusively to those, whom he, by his artful predication, has fatally deceived.*

The climax of Bernard would have been complete, had he subjoined: that this unheard of monster of depravity, this manifest child of Satan, after painfully wandering from place to place, after enduring a life of labour and discomfort and self-denial, after devoting himself to the propagation of what at least he deemed the Gospel of Christ; braved death, either in the flames or in a dungeon, rather than renounce the principles, which, during a term of more than twenty years, he had cherished and acted upon.

* Non est hic homo a Deo, qui sic contraria Deo et facit et loquitur. Proh dolor, auditur tamen a pluribus: et populum, qui sibi credat, habet.—Nescio qua arte diabolica, persuasit populo stulto et insipienti, de re manifesta, nec suis credere oculis, fefellisse priores, errare posteros, totum mundum etiam post effusum Christi sanguinem perditum iri, et, ad solos quos decipit, totas miserationum Dei divitias et universitatis gratiam pervenisse. Bernard. Epist. cexl. ad Ildefonsum Comitem Sancti Egidii de Henrico hæretico. Oper. col. 1591, 1592.