

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

use of the "sensible" they may actually be prevented from apprehending the spiritual which transcends it.

There are many other parts of this deeply interesting book to which we should have liked to call attention. Especially should we have liked to examine the excellent appendices on "Personal Identity" and "Freewill," the final pages of the latter being among the most admirable pieces of practical ethical writing and teaching we have seen for a long time past; but we have already outrun our space, and very possibly the patience of our readers.

We heartily commend this book as a thoughtful and reverent effort towards the solution of problems which lie very near us all.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.



ART. IV.—THE ALBIGENSES.

PART III.

LEAVING now the evidence which has been submitted elucidating the Albigensian and Waldensian doctrines and practices, we turn to the history of their suppression. A convenient starting-point is afforded us in the Council of Tours (A.D. 1163), at which it was ordered, under Canon 4, that the heretics, *in partibus Tolosæ*, were to be placed under anathema; that no one should deal with them, or receive them; and that when arrested they were to be brought before "Catholic" princes and deprived of their goods. But resolutions are one thing, action upon them is another, and practically those against whom the canon was directed remained undisturbed. Its harmlessness acted rather as an incentive, and as Roger Hoveden says, "The Arian heresy spread so rapidly that the King of France, and his 'man' the King of England, sent Peter Chrysogonus (Cardinal, Legate, and a Cistercian), Henry of Clairvaux, Archbishops and Bishops," into the infected district, "in order that by their preaching they might convert the heretics to the Christian faith"; while Raymond, Count of Toulouse, Raymond, Count of Castranovo, and others, were appointed by the said Kings to aid the Commissioners in the work of conversion. Henry of Clairvaux declares in a letter which he addressed "to the Catholic world" that, if they had deferred their visit for three years, scarcely one person would have remained orthodox. But imposing as was the personnel of this commission, its sole result was the condemnation and excommunication of

two insignificant Albigenses, Raymond and Bernard by name. Something more systematic was determined upon by Pope Lucius III. ; for in the first year of his pontificate (A.D. 1181) he issued a decree that all receivers and defenders of heretics were to suffer the same punishment as the heretics themselves. If a clergyman, he was to be deprived of all the privileges of his Order, and handed over for punishment to the secular arm, unless, immediately after his arrest, he returned freely and fully into the unity of the "Catholic Church," publicly confessed his error, and made due satisfaction. If a layman, he was to be delivered to the secular power for punishment, unless he publicly recanted. This decree was to be published on all the great festivals by all the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, under penalty of suspension for three years. "Every bishop, in person, or by his archdeacon as deputy, shall, twice or thrice in a year, go through every parish in which it is reported that heretics reside ; he shall summon three or four good men and true, or if expedient, all the people, and compel them to swear that they would report to the bishop or archdeacon any heretics, and those who frequented secret meetings, or sever themselves from the society of the faithful." All counts, barons, etc., were enjoined to do their utmost to suppress infidelity. Such was the plan of the campaign ; but a plan it remained. Lucius himself was too much engaged in his conflict with Frederick Barbarossa, while those to whom the task was committed were either deeply involved, by themselves or by their relations, in heretical opinions, or else had no inclination to exchange the luxury and repose of their palaces for the hardships and dangers of religious strife. These elaborate, but spasmodic, efforts were mere flashes in the pan, and, so far from daunting the sectaries, were regarded by them as so many exposures of their enemies' weakness, and emboldened the more timid amongst them to declare themselves in their true colours. The leader of the heretics at that time, named Peter Mauran, was summoned to appear before a Council held at Toulouse.

So greatly, however, did the Commissioners "fear the people," that only after descending to flattery could they induce Peter to present himself before them. The sentence passed upon him was that he was to be deprived of all his possessions, to present himself during a period of eighty days at different churches in Toulouse, with bare shoulders, there to be chastized, and to go to Jerusalem for three years. But it is quite uncertain whether this sentence was actually carried out. Robert de Monte, a contemporary chronicler, declares that the Commission was utterly ineffective ; and Roger Hoveden confesses that the Legate and his companions were

hooted through the streets with cries of "Apostates! Heretics! Hypocrites!" This is further confirmed by William of Puy Laurens. He tells us, in his "Chronicle," that he purposes to relate only those things which he had seen and heard. In his preface he states: "The chaplains (*capellani*) were held in such contempt by the laity that their name was as much a byword and a reproach as the name of Jew. Thus, just as it was said, 'I would rather be a Jew than do this or that'; so it was also said, 'I would rather be a chaplain.'" The clergy, if they appeared in the public streets, had to hide the tonsure. Knights no longer presented for ordination their own sons, but those of their vassals. "The heretics have filled the land, as if the Lord has ordained now as He did in the primitive Church, 'how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called'" (1 Cor. i. 27, 28). Emboldened by numbers, and by the support of the aristocracy, the Albigenses publicly buried those who, while alive, had had the ceremony of hereticon performed over them. Not always could the Legate venture upon putting a heretic upon his trial, but had to content himself with a disputation as between equals. Thus, at a disputation held at Pamiers, the sister of Bernard Roger, Count of Foix, openly defended the Albigensian opinions, and was scolded by Brother Stephen, one of the Cistercian mission, who told her that such speech ill-became her, and that she should rather mind her distaff. Sometimes the discussion was carried on in writing, as at Mont Royal in 1207, between Peter of Castelnau, Radulf and others, as champions of the Roman side, and Arnala and Willabert, of the Albigensian side. William of Puy Laurens says he had not been able to see the papers, as they were alleged to have been destroyed in the war.

All contemporary writers agree that the private lives and official practices of the clergy were scandalous. Benefices were kept vacant, and their emoluments appropriated by the patrons. The simoniac Bishop of Toulouse was succeeded by Fulk the troubadour. Their Christianity was merely a refined heathenism of an Oriental character. The clergy sought for money, not to distribute it amongst the poor, or to spend it in other good works, but to adorn and beautify their houses, or to administer to their pleasures. Was it to be wondered at that the Albigensian heresy made such headway when morality was pitted against orthodoxy? The several Counts, too, found more congenial occupation in warring against one another than in uniting to eradicate opinions which were largely aboriginal.

It was not until the strongest of all Popes, Innocent III.,

ascended the pontifical throne that the work of suppression was taken in hand at all seriously. He wrote (A.D. 1199) an urgent letter to the Archbishop of Auch, and a few months later he issued a mandate upon the subject to all the great prelates of the South of France, to all princes, counts, barons, and all Christian people. Two legates, Rainer and Guy, were despatched into the country, and the temporal power was cited to support them. Letter and mandate and legate were received with equal indifference. But Innocent was not the man to be denied. He replaced Rainer and Guy by two other legates, Peter and Radulf, to be joined later on by Arnald D'Amauri. The Archbishop of Narbonne was severely censured for remissness, and the King of France was called to the aid of the Church. By this time, however, so strong was the hold that these obnoxious opinions had upon the Albigenses, that the legates found their expulsion by no means an easy task. The King of France came not, nor sent "to the help of the Lord"; the whole of Southern France was disturbed by the private wars of the nobles; the clergy were either apathetic, or those who were zealous had, by their malpractices, lost all influence over the popular mind. The obvious policy, therefore, of the legates was to attempt to make peace amongst the nobles, and then to unite them against the heretics. Raymond, Count of Toulouse, and the most influential of the nobles, refused the terms of peace proposed by Peter and Radulf. He saw that the safety of the people lay in the mutual hostilities of their rulers. He had been brought up from his cradle amongst the heretics, and was favourably disposed towards them. Peter of Vaux-Sarnai says that the Count was secretly a heretic himself, and had once hired a fool to mock the Bishop in church. The prospects of the mission, therefore, were very gloomy and hopeless, when there came to the aid of the Church, all unexpectedly, two events which eventually crowned the efforts of "the faithful" with inglorious success.

The first event to which we refer was the visit of Diego and Dominic. Either in 1204 or 1207, and either at Narbonne or Montpellier (the evidence for date and place being contradictory and well-balanced), the legates fell in with these two men, one of whom was destined to leave the impress of his personality for all time upon the Roman Church. Diego and Dominic, Bishop and Prior of Ozma respectively, were returning from Denmark, whither they had been sent on matters matrimonial by the King of Castile. Passing through the South of France, they were astounded at the hold "Manicheism" had upon the country. Perhaps upon the principle that "lookers-on see most of the game," the legates, utterly

disheartened with their failures, consulted the new arrivals, and begged their advice. But so far from receiving any sympathy, they were severely rebuked for their mode of life. How could they expect to succeed, surrounded by such pomp and luxury? "By their fruits ye shall know them." Let them emulate the austerity and poverty of the heretics. Let them endure hardness as good soldiers of the Lord Jesus Christ. Let them approach more nearly to the simplicity of the Apostles, whose successors they were. Diego and Dominic set the example, and the Legates followed. Dominic had, when at Ozma, been accustomed to renounce the seclusion of the Priory, and come forth and preach, "giving up," as Jordan says, "Rachel for Leah"—that is, the speculative life for the practical. Preaching seemed to Diego *the* weapon that was needed to use against the sectaries; and acting upon this opinion, he set out for Rome to gain the Pope's permission to his renouncing his bishopric and devoting the rest of his life to preaching against heresy. The first request was refused, the second granted in part. He was allowed to return to France *for a time*, and assault the strongholds of Satan with the artillery of eloquence. Gathering together a company of thirty Cistercian monks, Diego and Dominic went everywhere, reproofing, rebuking, exhorting. From this eventually sprang the famous Dominican Order. But it is worth observing here that while the actual *work* of founding that Order belongs to Dominic, the *idea* of such an Order must be fathered upon Diego. For as he and his company traversed the country from one end to the other, it became evident that the whole attack required cohesion and organization. Bishops, legates, preachers, were all acting separately, every man doing that which was right in his own eyes—no plan, no principle, no discipline. To Diego must be given the credit of the *idea* of forming a definite Order of preachers, going forth under the immediate authority of the Pope, and independent of all other domination, ecclesiastical or secular, to proclaim the faith of the Church, to dispel all ignorance and refute all heresy, not as a temporary but a permanent body, not only for Toulouse and the Albigenes, but for all the world—the weapon upon which the Church could depend for offence and defence in matters of faith; a society within the Church, under perfect discipline, thoroughly instructed for the work it had to do, and moving everywhere as one man.

Ten years elapsed, however, before such an Order was launched upon Europe. Meanwhile Diego and his companions went about preaching. After two years Diego returned to his Diocese of Ozma, and Dominic succeeded him

as leader of the preachers—"vexillifer," as William of Puy Laurens styles him. But the "vexillifer," or standard-bearer, though he did most of the fighting, and led the forces, was not the General as well, two posts which had been combined in Diego. To this latter post was appointed Bernard Guido, Abbot of Vaux-Sarnai, and afterwards Bishop of Carcassone. "Unity is strength"; and in order to obtain that unity which his predecessor had desired, Bernard Guido summoned to the Church of St. Stephen at Toulouse the *Curia regalis*, the *consules Tolosani*, and all the clergy and people, and exacted from them the following comprehensive oath: "We, Ugo Gerald, Doctor of Laws and Knight of our Lord the King of France, holding the place of Seneschal of Toulouse and Albigesium, and Uvo, Doctor of Laws, Judge of our Lord the King at Toulouse, and John de Turre, keeper of the arms of our Lord the King, and Peter Gaurand, Lawyer, holding the place of Vicar of Toulouse, swear by these holy Gospels of God that the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the Roman Church we will keep and cause to be kept, and will defend the same with all our might against all. Item: That we will persecute, arrest, and cause to be arrested the heretics—*credentes, fautores, receptores*—whenever we can, and will accuse and denounce them to the Church and the Inquisitors, wheresoever we may know them to be. Item: That we will not commit any bailiwick, administration, or public office to anyone of the aforesaid pestiferous persons, nor those suspected or reported to be heretical, nor to anyone who has been by reason of the crime of heresy disqualified from performing any public office; nor will we receive any of the aforesaid, nor knowingly have them in our family or company or service or counsels; and if by chance we should in ignorance act otherwise, after it has been brought to our notice, we will immediately expel them, and in these and in other ways which belong to the office of the Inquisition, be obedient to God, the Roman Church, and the Inquisitors. So help us God and these holy Gospels of God."

One prelate, at any rate, immediately gave good proof of his sincerity. Fulk, Bishop of Toulouse, once a troubadour, assisted Dominic in the foundation of a small monastery at Prouille, near Fanjeaux (*Fanum Jovis*) "for the reception of certain noble ladies whose parents, through stress of poverty, were about to hand them over to the care of the heretics" (Guido's Chronicle in Martene and Durand, vol. vi.).

Humbert tells us that one day after Dominic had finished his sermon, nine matrons threw themselves at his feet, begging him to tell them what was the truth, as hitherto they had followed "the good men," but were now shaken in their faith.

These formed the nucleus of another monastery, and Dominic intrusted to them the instruction of children in the tenets of the Roman Church. For nearly ten years we now lose sight of Dominic. The voice of the preacher was soon to be overpowered by the thunders of war. His work during all these years is summed up in a sentence of Humbert's: "The blessed Dominic remained for ten years practically alone, with few adherents, with no possessions, upholding the Catholic faith throughout Narbonne, Carcassone and Fanjeaux, enduring much distress, insult and obloquy."

It has been asserted that Dominic was never a persecutor, that he never used force to put down heresy, and therefore cannot be charged with being the founder of the Inquisition. We have, however, already seen the spirit of the times, and we have a right to demand direct evidence that he stood apart from that spirit and was an exception. It has been said that only once did he depart from the policy of persuasion, and that was when he prayed, "Lord, stretch forth Thy hand, that by tribulation and vexation they may have understanding." But Dominic, it may legitimately be inferred from the character of the times, would do his best to practise what he prayed. Dominic was a Spaniard, and the Spanish disposition does not incline to the side of mercy. He must have taken an active part in exacting that oath of persecution from prince, prelate, and people at Toulouse. And the question is finally answered by the following decree which he issued at this time. "By the authority of the Lord Abbot of Citeaux, legate of the Apostolic See, who has laid this office upon me, we have reconciled the bearer of these presents, Pontius Roger, who has turned from the sect of the heretics, God being gracious unto him; and we demand, in virtue of his oath to the prelate, that on three Sundays and three festivals, he shall be led, naked, except for drawers, from the entrance of his house (or village) to the church, and *scourged* by the priest." He was to abstain from flesh, eggs and cheese always, except at Easter, Whitsun and Christmas; to wear the "religious" garments and the crosses. Moreover, he decreed that those that were obdurate were to be burnt; and this punishment was actually inflicted upon Guraud of Castelnuovo, "*digna recipiens stipendia meritorum.*" The subsequent horrors of the Inquisition, it is true, cannot be paralleled by the like in these early days. They must, nevertheless, be regarded as natural developments of its first principles and practices; and Dominic, in this matter of coercion, was like the habit of his Order—neither wholly black nor wholly white, but more black than white.

It was not, however, either by preaching or persecution that

the tide eventually turned in favour of Rome. It was "a fortunate accident." The blood of a martyr, whether in a good or bad cause, is often the seed of the Church; and so it proved in this instance. The people became daily more and more exasperated by this prolonged and persistent interference with their religious and civil liberty; and it was not to be expected from those times that blood might be shed on one side without some retaliation from the other. At length an event occurred which, for the horror it excited, can only be compared with that aroused by the murder of Becket some forty years before. In A.D. 1208 Peter the legate was assassinated on the banks of the Rhone by one of Raymond's soldiers. Baronius declares that Raymond "*subornavit* perditissimos satellites qui legatum Rhodanum trajecturum hasta transfodere." But contemporary evidence does not confirm this statement. The Anonymous Chronicler acquits Raymond of all complicity, and says that the deed was committed *in a moment of irritation* by one of Raymond's suite when discussing with the legate some point of doctrine; and that Raymond, had he caught the murderer, would have punished him. Peter of Vaux-Sarnai, whose bias is obvious on every page, says that Raymond received the murderer after the crime, whereas the "anonymous" historian asserts that he fled to his own home. William of Puy Laurens speaks more guardedly. The legate passed away to God per "*gladius impiorum, cujus rei suspicione Comes non caruit.*" Innocent struck while the iron was hot. It was an opportunity which that keen statesman was not likely to let slip. Before the horror and indignation of Europe cooled, the Pope, without trial or explanation, launched his bolt of excommunication against Raymond and the actual murderer, as well as against all who had in any way aided and abetted him, or should hereafter receive and protect him. As for Raymond in particular, Innocent charges him with having laid snares for the murdered servant of God, received the actual murderer with the greatest cordiality, and rewarded him with many gifts. But he can go no further than "*presumitur esse reus,*" and that he (Raymond) had acted thus "*sicut asseritur.*" Nevertheless, this sentence is to be published everywhere with bells and candles. Moreover, "since, according to the canonical sanctions of the holy Fathers, faith need not be kept with him who keeps not faith with God, all who have made with Raymond any promise, alliance, or bond whatsoever, are absolved from all obligations, and it is further permitted to any Catholic, saving the rights of the principal lord, not only to persecute the said Raymond, but to occupy and retain his land until he should repent and make restitution." Special letters were also sent

to Philip, King of France, either to go himself, or at least send his son Louis, to the aid of the Church. Philip replied that he had "two great and grievous lions" on either side of him, viz., Otto the Emperor, and John, King of England; that for the present he dare not leave France, nor spare his son, but he had no objections to his barons going. Innocent disregarded these excuses, and retorted with a *general* letter "to all prelates, counts, barons, and the whole people in the Kingdom of France, urging them to at once avenge the insult done to the Crucified, and promising them forgiveness of all their sins, "dummodo contriti essent pariter et confessi." There was thus let loose upon some of the fairest provinces of la belle France, at the instigation of the "Vicar of Christ," a bloody war that lasted for half a century, and only expired through sheer exhaustion of the combatants. It came at a time when unhappily the mind of man was direfully ripe for such occupation. It afforded an outlet, nearer home than the Holy Land, for the crusading spirit of the age. The Kings of France were slowly but surely curtailing the independence of the nobles, and extending the boundaries of the kingdom from ocean to river, from channel to mountain. Philip was more than willing that his nobles should weaken themselves in battle-fields which drew their minds and strength away from their home interests; while he intervened only when he feared one or the other was getting too strong in these southern provinces. The Church had never been more powerful, nor its creed more compact. Against these repressive forces, from within and from without, were arrayed the rooted conviction that the Roman Church did not represent the Church of Christ and His Apostles either in doctrines or ceremonies; indignation at the arrogance and contempt for the dissoluteness of the clergy; a desire for Scriptural truth, quickened but not satisfied by the translation into the vulgar tongue of some parts of the Bible; and a traditional resentment against all interference from outsiders in matters civil or religious. It was a struggle for supremacy between *lex* or *luz*.

H. J. WARNER.

