

THE SOUTHERN
PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXVI.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXXV.

ARTICLE I.

A TRUE CONSERVATISM.

In Church and State, in sect and party, the words *conservative* and *radical* have acquired a prominence and an emphasis, in the present, never accorded to them in the past. In the pulpit, the senate, and the forum, as well as in the columns of the journal and the pages of the essay or the review, these two terms are the recognised landmarks of every form of modern thought and disquisition. They are the poles of feeling, of taste, of opinion and principle. Every one who talks or writes at all, claims for himself that he belongs to one of these categories, and insists on referring an opponent to the opposite. In American politics we not only discover that the two great parties into which our population is divided are essentially different in the sense of these two criteria, but that each party is further divisible into a conservative and a radical section. There are Republicans who insist upon keeping their party rigidly in the line of its precedents, and others who maintain that its original mission has been fulfilled, and the time has come to propound new issues before the people. There are also Democrats who desire to continue the conflict on principles announced a century ago, whilst others urge the necessity of contending for the more practical interests of the present generation.

ous voices in that glad acclaim: "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory, for thy mercy, and for thy truth's sake" (Ps. cxv. 1).

ARTICLE VI.

HARBINGERS OF THE REFORMATION.

We meet in the twelfth century and thereafter with a variety of sects passing under the general name of the Cathari, some of Eastern origin, as the Bogomiles and Euchites; and others of Eastern origin, but dwelling in the West, as the Paulicians and the Pasagii (or *passengers*, that is, *pilgrims*); still others of Western origin, as well as residence, as the *Apostolicals* of Cologne and of Perigueux in France, the Petrobrussians, the Henricians, the followers of Arnold of Brescia, and of Peter Waldo. All these differing in many respects from one another, are to be viewed as the offspring of a reaction in the Church against what Neander calls the *churchly theocratic system* (Neander, IV., p. 605). Some of them, as the Petrobrussians, Henricians, and Apostolicals, show a remarkable affinity of spirit and of principles. Yet we are not, says Neander, to ascribe to them a common external descent. They were rather the offspring of certain ideas and tendencies, diffusing themselves abroad as through an atmosphere and breaking forth to view in one point and another without being traceable to any single point. They were all harbingers of the Reformation, which was steadily becoming a necessity for the Church. The Church had been secularised; Jewish and Christian elements had been confused together in its forms and doctrines. And the Christian consciousness must be expected to rouse up against this foreign matter (Vol. IV., p. 592) to repel it. At the head of this movement of reform the Popes had set themselves, ever since 1049, when Leo IX. became Pope. Gregory VII. had stirred up the people against the corrupt clergy.

Such a movement on the part of the Popes was a dangerous one, for it might lead further than they intended. It actually did so. It gave rise to separatist tendencies. It led the people to wish to have nothing to do with the corrupt clergy, as being unfit to perform any sacramental act, and from this beginning to go still farther and declare the sacraments of a corrupt Church to be null and void. The important controversy about *Investitures* followed after these reformatory movements of Hildebrand and his party, and this called the attention of the people still more closely to the boundaries between Church and State and to the respective rights of each. Pope Paschal declared the *regalia* a foreign possession, dangerous to the Church, drawing aside her officers from their appropriate spiritual duties, and also betraying them into a dependence on the secular power. Was it not to be expected that a party should arise demanding that Bishops and Abbots, in order to be excused from taking the oaths of the princes, should restore their *regalia* to the temporal power, and so separate things spiritual from things secular?

Arnold of Brescia, a young clergyman, gave the first impulse to this new reaction against the secularisation of the Church and the power of the Popes in temporal things. He was one of the pupils of the famous Abelard, and with many other youth assembled in the lonely region of Noyes around that great teacher, he cheerfully submitted to the meagre fare and many other deprivations necessary to be undergone in order to have their souls fired by his enthusiasm. Amongst other things attractive in the lectures of Abelard were the sharp rebukes he gave to the ecclesiastics and monks. These things found a fruitful soil in the warm and earnest heart of young Arnold, and he returned from Noyes to his native city, Brescia, inflamed with a holy ardor for reform.

The change in him was evident to all, and he made no concealment of it. His doctrine, zealously preached, was that the clergy should return to the apostolical simplicity in their whole lives, and his example corresponded to his preaching. His preaching found ready response in the hearts of the laity. Much of it was exactly suited to inflame the tinder in their hearts which

had been already prepared there by the collision of the spirit of political freedom with the power of the higher clergy. A prodigious effect was produced all over Italy. Pope Innocent II., at the Lateran Council in 1139, declared against him, and commanded him to quit Italy. He did go to France and was thence expelled and went to Switzerland, whither St. Bernard's denunciations followed him. But the effects of his movement remained in Italy. The Romans cared less for his religious spirit than for the political aspirations he had excited in them. These political excitements continued through the reign of several Popes. Under Adrian IV., in 1155, Arnold was hanged, and then his body burned and the ashes thrown into the Tiber, lest they should be preserved by the people as relics of a martyr. The Emperor Frederic I. had aided Adrian in thus disposing of Arnold. But the idea of the martyr of reform survived him. And even Frederic afterwards attached himself to it, and with him began the one hundred years controversy with the Popes by the Hohenstaufen family—a contest not with one prince, but with three in succession, pursuing with steady energy and craft one constant plan.

Peter Bruys was likewise a priest of the south of France. He is charged with denying the authority of any scripture except Christ's words, and also with rejecting the Lord's Supper and the atoning merits of Christ's death. He also denied infant baptism, and, it is said, defended this on the ground that infants cannot be saved. He is nearly the first person we meet with in the whole course of church history who denied infant baptism—for Tertullian, about two hundred years after Christ, who is the only predecessor of any note that Peter Bruys had on this point—Tertullian only opposed infant baptism out of the superstitious idea he had adopted, that baptism is always accompanied with remission, and that sins after baptism are particularly dangerous, for remission of sins was by baptism and baptism could be administered only once; so that sin after baptism must be very dangerous, and therefore baptism ought to be postponed to the latest moment. We are aware that Neander takes a different view of this matter, and holds that baptism was at first only to adults,

and that Irenæus in the latter part of the second century was "the first church teacher who makes any allusion to infant baptism" (Vol. I., 311); and that Tertullian's opposition to it shows it had not yet got established fully in the Church. But Justin Martyr, who preceded Irenæus by some twenty-five years, alludes to infant baptism in a passage where he says of certain Christians of his time, that "οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ"; how could they have been made disciples of Christ except by baptism? "Go make disciples, baptizing," said Christ; that is, *μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες*. And as to Neander's *authority* on this subject, we prefer that of Augustine, who lived only three hundred years from the apostles; Neander six times three hundred. Neander says it arose in the second century. Augustine says what Origen said also near two hundred years before him, that it is an "apostolical institution," "established by no council of the Church, but practised always, and from the beginning, by the Church." The same is confirmed by Pelagius, who declares that he had "never heard of any, even the most impious heretic, who denied baptism to infants." ¹

To return to Peter Bruys: he and his followers rejected the name of Anabaptists, because denying infant baptism, he of course could not acknowledge any person baptized in infancy to be baptized at all, and so he maintained that he was only bestowing a first baptism on those who joined his party. In his zeal against the corruptions of the times he was led to burn all the crosses he could get hold of, and counselled the pulling down of all the churches, maintaining that God "can be worshipped as well in the shop or market as in a church." He also rejected all prayers for the dead, insisting that we cannot affect the state of the departed. He preached zealously for twenty years; and was at last seized by a mob in Languedoc and burnt at the stake.

Henry of Cluny was also a monk and a deacon. He had read the New Testament, and this fired his soul. He began to preach in Lausanne and afterwards in France. Unlike Peter, he held up *the cross* as the banner of his cause. He must have been a great and eloquent preacher. He was also of strict morals. It

¹ See SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, April, 1858.

is said a heart of stone must have melted under his preaching of repentance. He chained the people everywhere to himself, and filled them with hatred and contempt for the higher clergy. He acquired wide and unbounded influence, and exercised it for reforming the lives and morals of the people for many years. He was at last condemned to imprisonment for life, with a meagre diet, in the city of Rheims, where he died. He, also, was against infant baptism.

As to the Waldenses, Neander holds that there is a foundation for their claim to the highest antiquity for their sect; that is, that from the time of the first secularisation of the Church by Constantine's gift to Roman Bishop Silvester, such an opposition as finally broke forth in them had all along been existing. He repudiates the idea of the Waldenses owing their origin to the times and events of the history of Claudius of Turin. Yet he makes Peter Waldo the father of their sect, as it appears in more modern days.

He was a rich citizen of Lyons. In an assembly once of respectable citizens, where he was present, one suddenly died. This incident (as in Luther's case with his young friend) led Peter to consecrate himself to a religious life. He employed two ecclesiastics, one a man of some learning and the other a practised writer, for a certain sum of money, to prepare for him a translation of the Gospels and other portions of the Bible into the Romance language, which the one was to dictate and the other to write down. He also procured a collection of pious sayings of the church fathers. Reading all these with great diligence, he is confirmed in his religious views. He distributes all his property amongst the poor, and filled with the desire to follow the apostles in evangelical poverty, he seeks to establish a society of apostolics for the spread of religious truth. He therefore procures multiplied copies of his Romance version of the Scriptures, which by degrees was extended to the whole Bible. Waldo and his brethren had at first no thought of separation from the Church, but simply of establishing a spiritual society, like many others in her service. He entered into no conscious opposition to her doctrines, and practical religion was what he aimed at through the

dissemination of scripture truth. Yet the Archbishop of Lyons forbade Waldo and his companions to expound the Scriptures, and sought to suppress their society. They appealed to Pope Alexander III., but he confirmed the Archbishop's decision, and so they were forced to a decision whether to obey or stand forth in opposition to the Church.

As the origin of the Waldenses is to be traced to the reading of the Bible, to this direction (says Neander) they always remained true, and a great knowledge of the Bible distinguished both men and women amongst them. Raynerus Sachonus, who was at first a partisan, but afterwards became an opposer, of these sects, lived himself for seventeen years among the Cathari, and was a leader among them. (Mosheim, Vol. II., p. 266, note 7.) He tells us (writing in the thirteenth century) that "some traced the beginning of the Waldenses to the time of Pope Silvester, but others up to the time of the apostles." And he writes of an illiterate peasant amongst these people who had learned by heart the book of Job, and several others who had committed to memory the whole New Testament. Here are some of Rainer's statements respecting these former associates of his: "They are orderly and modest in their manners; their dress is neither expensive nor mean; they eschew oaths, falsehood, and fraud; they engage in no sort of traffic. They live on what they earn by the labor of their hands from day to day. Even shoe makers are teachers among them. They amass no wealth, and are contented with the bare necessaries of life. They are also chaste. They are never found hanging about wine-shops. They attend no balls nor other vanities. They govern their passions. They are always at work." What a beautiful tribute, and that from an enemy to the pure Christian morality of the Waldenses!

Though, in general, they supported themselves by manual labor rather than by trade, and scattered themselves more among the people than the nobles, yet a number of them dealt in jewels and ornaments of dress as a means of access to the families of the great. When they had disposed of rings and trinkets, and were asked if they had nothing more to sell, they would answer: "Yes, we have jewels still more precious than any you have seen; we

would be glad to shew you these also if you will promise not to betray us to the clergy." On being assured that they should be safe, they would say: "We have a stone so brilliant that by its light a man may see God; another which radiates such a fire as to enkindle the love of God in the heart of its possessor." The precious stones they meant (says Neander) were passages of the Holy Scriptures in their various applications.

The Waldenses went on the principle that the Scriptures are the only source of the knowledge of the Christian faith, and that whatever could not be derived from them is to be rejected. This is precisely our doctrine: that the Bible is the sole and sufficient rule of faith and practice; that the whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for his glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture; and that whatever in religion is not commanded is forbidden.

It has been said they denied infant baptism, but undoubtedly this is not true.

But it was not only the sects that cried out against the secularisation of the Church, and held up reformation as necessary. The conviction (says Neander) continually gained force on the minds of men generally that the superfluity of earthly goods was working ruin to the Church itself. They saw her arrived at the summit of power, and that through her secularising spirit she was becoming estranged from her true calling. The Hohenstaufen Emperors and that large party which attached itself to them as complainants against the Church, and the national bards of Germany were loud in their declarations that the degeneracy of the Church proceeded from the riches lavished upon her. Then in addition to all these, there arose prophets, in this age, to oppose and denounce the corruptions of the Church. Neander well remarks (Vol. IV., pp. 215, 216), that a certain faculty of prophecy seems to be implanted in the spirit of humanity, that undefined presentiments often hasten to anticipate the future, and that the kingdom of God forms in the course of its development from beginning to end one connected whole, and strives towards its own completion according to sure and certain laws. The germ

of the unknown future is already contained in the past. Accordingly (he says) out of the consciousness of the corruption of the Church sprang the presentiment of a future regeneration, and so he finds yet other premonitions of the Reformation in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries besides those harbingers of it which the sects constituted. (Vol. IV., 216.)

The Abbot Joachim is one of the representatives of this prophetic spirit. He presided over the monastery of Corace in Calabria, and he died about the year 1202. He was an enthusiastic friend of monasticism and the contemplative life, and looked for the regeneration of the Church from thence. The reigning corruption he judged to proceed from secularisation, and also from a fondness for dry and meagre conceptions of the understanding.

His times were near the close of the twelfth century, when Papacy was emerging victorious out of contest with Frederic I., but new storms were to be expected from the side of the powerful house of Frederic. Joachim detested Germany. The German imperial power is the one he was inclined to believe which would be appointed to execute judgment on the Church. His writings found great acceptance. He was looked on as inspired. The Franciscans thought they found a prophecy of their order in his books. And the writings themselves being put loosely together, interpretations of them were easy, and doubtless also were practised.

In his commentary on Jeremiah, Joachim complains of the exactions of the Roman Church, calls her also the house of the courtesan where all practise Simony, and the door is thrown open to any who will knock—decries the indulgences—denounces the legates and the fleshly-living cardinals and Popes. He even accuses and condemns the Popes for their seeking after temporal power, and contending with princes. He complains of the confidence in external things which drew men away from true penitence. And he announces terrible judgments that would come on the Church by means of the secular power combining with the heretical sects. In this description of the judgments that were to come by the secular power, the house of Hohenstaufen held a prominent place.

Joachim was, of course, an opponent of the prevailing dialectic tendency in religion. The latter days of the Church were to be days of all-satisfying contemplation. There were three periods of Revelation and of history, answering to the three Persons of the Trinity. The times of the Old Testament belong especially to God the Father, who then especially revealed himself as the Almighty by signs and wonders. The times of the New Testament to the Word of God then revealed, where predominates the striving after a comprehensible *knowledge* of mysteries. The last times belong to the Holy Spirit, when the fire of love in contemplation will predominate. Of these three periods the three Apostles, Peter, Paul, and John, are representatives. Peter represents the power of faith, which works miracles. Paul that of knowledge. John the contemplative faculty and tendency. And as John outlived the other two, so the Johannean contemplative period of the Church would be the last, and corresponds to the age of the Holy Spirit. Then will be the Jubilee—when all mysteries shall be laid open—earth be full of knowledge of the Lord, and there be not a race to be found who will deny that Christ is Son of God. The Spirit will then stand forth free from the veil of the letter. The gospel of the Spirit then is *the everlasting gospel*, for the gospel of the letter is but temporary.

It is easy to see that this doctrine of Joachim might be applied in different ways. It might suggest not only the coming of a time of purifying for the Church, when the spirit of secularisation and of externalisation should give way to the development of the real and pure inner life of Christianity, but it might also develop a tendency to a false inwardness and subjectivity—a tendency aiming at and predicting the dissolution of everything positive in religion, and consequently of Christianity itself. And in fact it did receive application in both these ways. It did give rise on the one side to many honest efforts, both *within* and *without* the Church, after reformation of Christianity, and it did also come at a later period to be so applied by a rationalistic, pantheistic party as to make Christianity itself only a transient form of religious development, which should give way to a purely inward religion of the Spirit, consisting of an intuition of God that stood in need of no intermediate organ.

Neander observes that the reaction of this prophetic spirit against the secularisation of the Church, proceeded from monasticism, Joachim being as was said the head of the monastery of Corace in Calabria. In fact, he says (Vol. IV., p. 232) that many another appearance of the same kind down to the time of Luther proceeded from the same spirit. Nor was this (says he) an accidental thing, but connected with the essential character of monasticism itself. For we may regard monasticism itself in general as a reaction, though one-sided, of the Christian spirit against the secularisation of the Church and of the Christian life. True, monasticism itself was seized and borne along by the current of secularisation, but even then it ever gave birth to new *reactions of reform* against the encroaching tide of corruption. Accordingly this form of the manifestation of the Christian life is one of the most influential and significant facts of this period.

In the third place, then, we mention monks as they appear now upon the stage of Church History along with sects and prophets as harbingers of the Reformation. But it is not *monks in general*, but the *mendicant* monks in particular, whom we would thus signalise. It was early in the thirteenth century that, notwithstanding the decree of the Lateran Council of 1215, against any new foundations of monks, two mendicant orders arose that were destined to exert the widest and mightiest influence. In these two orders, especially in that of St. Francis, we see the renascent power of that idea of following Christ and the apostles in evangelical poverty, and the absolute renunciation of all earthly goods, which from the times of the twelfth century made themselves manifest in the doctrine of Arnold of Brescia and the leaders of the sects generally, and likewise in the prophecies of Joachim, and which pointed so plainly to the coming Reformation.

Dominic, born in Castile in 1170, was distinguished while yet a student of the University of Palencia, in Spain, for his self-sacrificing Christian love. In a time of great famine he sold his books and furniture to get the means of providing for the wants of the poor. The bishop of his native diocese of Osma was Didacus, a man of severe character who sought to reform his

canons. Similarity of disposition united Dominic to him. He became one of his canons, journeyed with him on some public mission into the south of France, where the sects were very prevalent and attracted their special notice and consideration. In 1208 they came a second time into these regions and met there twelve Cistercian abbots, sent by Innocent III., to put down the sects. *They* travelled in state. Dominic and his bishop pointed out to them their error and advised them to imitate the poverty of the persons extolled and followed by these sects. Didacus and Dominic being listened to by them joined the company, and on that new principle they travelled about and battled for three years with the sects. Dominic subsequently succeeded to the work. Afterwards the crusade against the heretics was commenced, and Dominic approved of the cruelties employed. In 1215 he went to Rome to obtain from Innocent III. his sanction for the institution of a new order of men devoted to the office of preaching. Thus began the order of St. Dominic. It was called *Ordo Predicatorum*. It was to hold neither property in funds nor income.

Francis, born at Assisi in 1182, was son of a Spanish merchant. His mind was, perhaps, weakened by a severe illness—at least, he became after it much drawn away from all worldly affairs, and seems to have been under the influence of a kind of insane fanaticism. He constantly saw visions and heard voices.

When he first appeared in 1210 before Innocent III. walking in his palace plunged in thought, the Pope motioned him away with contempt. But it is said he had himself that night a vision which changed his impressions of Francis. At least it was not long before Innocent conceived a high respect for Francis' idea—the idea of a society of spiritual paupers placed alongside a Church doing homage to worldly power and glory—an idea which might serve to take away the advantage which poverty gave to many of the new sects hostile to the Church.

St. Francis was a preacher of great power. Once when about to preach before the Roman court, the Pope and the cardinals, a discourse he had carefully written and memorised, of a sudden it all left him, and he had not a word to say. He openly avowed

what had occurred, and invoked the grace of the Holy Spirit, and then found utterance for words full of power, producing a wonderful effect on all present. Bonaventura says of him: "His words penetrated like glowing fire to the innermost depths of the heart." What was there in this fanatic that should attract to him or impress such a man as Bonaventura, one of the acutest men of the age, and who afterwards became general of the order of Franciscans? There was in him, with all his fanaticism, a spirit which showed itself in such sayings as these: "A man is just so much and no more as he is in the sight of God." "No one should value himself on that which a sinner can do as well as he. The sinner can fast, pray, weep, and chastise his body. But one thing he cannot do—he cannot be faithful to his Lord. This alone, then, is our true glory, when we give to the Lord his glory, serving him faithfully and ascribing all to him which he bestows on us." He questioned whether he ought to give himself most to prayer or to preaching. Prayer deals with God, preaching with men. But the Son of God let himself down to men, and so ought he to quit *rest* and go about and preach. That preacher, however, is to be pitied who seeks his own glory in preaching. He commends to his monks meekness and peaceableness. He admonishes them not to judge those who lived in better style and went better dressed. "*Our* God is also their master, and is able also to justify them." He even warns his monks against excessive asceticism. God would have mercy and not sacrifice, and each person should consider his own constitution and avoid both extremes.

The greatest possible zeal and self-denial was exhibited by the monks of these orders, and the greatest degree of power and influence accordingly was acquired by them. So much the more certain, however, was it that their influence would be pernicious when abused. The causes which had introduced corruption into the other orders were active also amongst these. The special *protégés* of Popes, they became Popes' instruments for exacting money and for other bad purposes. They became obtrusive and selfish in aggrandising their own order at the expense of all others. In a word, their enormous influence threatened to over-

turn the whole previous constitution of the Church and to do away with all other links between the Pope and the Church.

Especially were the minds of the youth carried away—as that of Thomas Aquinas. The universities fell under their peculiar sway and influence, and by fair means or foul they established their authority in the families of noblemen and princes.

The University of Paris set itself against them, and according to its custom when they wished to impress the public mind against what they hated, shut up their lecture rooms and went thus into a retirement which the youth of the age and the city where they congregated for instruction could not endure. Innocent III., moved by the complaints thus urged against the Mendicants, undertook by his Bull in 1254 to curb their power. But his successor, Alexander IV., took the side of the Mendicants. William of St. Amour defended the University. Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventura, the two former Dominicans, and the latter a Franciscan, defended the orders. They finally conquered.

The attacks of the University were, however, grounded on faults and vices creeping in amongst these monks which could not be denied. And from these very corruptions, even before Francis' death, was formed the germ of a schism amongst his order—between the spirituals or strict Franciscans and the Cesarians or lax ones, which led to important consequences. The Popes favored the milder party, and accordingly interpreted the rule of Francis always in the mild sense. The spirituals, hence, were led into an attitude of opposition to the dominant Church itself. And these more zealous Franciscans were the very party that most delighted in the writings of the Abbot Joachim. There was accordingly engendered amongst them a spiritual pride of mysticism, ready to exalt itself above everything positive and objective in religion. And thus were these ideas of Joachim, alluded to above, appropriated by many fanatical tendencies and diffused by various kinds of Beghards, who were found among the Tertiarii of the general order of St. Francis.

Thus it was that the idea of evangelical poverty was first introduced into the hierarchy by means of the order of the Franciscans.

And thus it was, *again*, that the Popes, by their participation in the disputes of this order, and then siding with the milder party, became involved in a contest with the spirituals. And thus it was, *thirdly*, that this idea of evangelical poverty was set up against the worldliness of a Church, corrupted by superfluity of worldly goods and carnal delights, and that, *fourthly*, out of this antagonism there arose other antagonisms, other and various spiritual tendencies, appropriating after different ways the ideas they had seized on, which Arnold and Joachim and Francis had presented, and only agreeing together in their opposition to the existing Church form. Some of these tendencies, conscious that Christianity is itself the absolute religion, strove after a freer and more perfect development of the same, whereby it was to break through all human ordinances and to become independent of all outward means and appointments. Others, as Amalric of Bena, and David of Dimanto, and their followers, representing Christianity as being only a subordinate form of religion, which the mind, when arrived at manhood, should slough off, sought to introduce a mystical pantheism, and to exchange the Christian theism and the dependence of the soul on a Saviour of the world, for the self-deification of their own minds.

Mosheim refers to the Everlasting Gospel as really a book published by the Abbot Joachim. Neander, however, says there was no such book at all, but men vaguely referred to what he had foretold in his writings about the last time *as being the everlasting gospel*. The expression "*Everlasting Gospel*" Joachim himself had borrowed from Rev. xiv. 6 to express the idea of a new spiritual apprehension of Christianity, opposed to the sensuous catholic point of view, and answering to the age of the Holy Spirit. Occasionally also this "*everlasting gospel*," so ascribed to Joachim, was confounded with the book actually produced by Gerhard and called "*Introductorius in Evangelium Eternum*."

So, also, in regard to this Introduction, Neander doubts whether it contained any such doctrine about the destruction of Christianity as was put forth by its enemies. He says all the citations from it fail to make out any such doctrine.

After the condemnation of the Introductory there arose among

the spiritual Franciscans an extraordinary man named John Peter de Oliva, who gave fresh impulse to these ideas of Joachim. He was a fanatic, yet he possessed a profoundly speculative intellect. Many enemies were created by him through the zeal with which he inveighed against all departures among the Franciscans from the strict rule of their founder, and against the clergy for their luxury and pomp. Yet before his death he laid down a confession recanting everything he might have ever said against the Church, still reserving, however, to himself the liberty of refusing to follow any authority that contradicted the Sacred Scriptures or the essence of the Catholic faith. For all his antagonists he was more than a match in dialectics.

As a specimen of the Joachian ideas of this remarkable man, take the following:

“As it was the striving of the fathers in the first age of the world before Christ to proclaim the great works of the Lord from the creation of the world; and as the children of God in the second age of the world from Christ onwards, labored to explore the hidden wisdom, so nothing else remains for the third age but that we should sing God’s praise, while we magnify his great power and his manifold wisdom and goodness which are clearly revealed in his works and in the word of the Sacred Scriptures. For while in the first age of the world God the Father manifested himself as the terrible God, a being to be feared; and in the second age the Son manifested himself as a teacher and revealer—the Word of divine wisdom; he will, in the third age of the Holy Ghost, reveal himself as the flame of divine love and the fulness of all spiritual joy, so that all the wisdom of the incarnate Word and all the power of the Father will not merely be known, but also felt and experienced.”

Thus we get an idea of the tendency of his views. Complete estrangement from the world as opposed to the hitherto prevailing absorption in the world; the religion of intuition and feeling as opposed to the hitherto conceptual theology; pure passivity in the surrendering of one’s self up to the God-like as opposed to the hitherto prevalent self-activity of the intellect in the dialectic theology: this, according to Oliva and his spirituals, would form the glory of the latter days. The precursor of this new period of Christ’s glory was St. Francis; like Christ in being poor, and like him also in bearing even the print of the five wounds of our Saviour. The Church of Rome he calls “Babylon” and “the

great whore"; the good in her are like grains of gold in a vast sand heap; and the special seat of her corruption is in the fleshly clergy who hold her high places. Thus the spirituals under Oliva were as much harbingers of the Reformation as either sects or Joachimite prophets.

We recur again to the Apostolicals mentioned already as not very unlike the Petrobrussians and Henricians (Neander, IV., p. 604), to remark that in like manner their ideas bear a strong resemblance to those of Joachim, and assimilate them to him as well as to those sects. Indeed, Neander in so many words describes them (IV., 626) as the direct fruit of the ideas of Arnold and of Joachim. Their founder, Segarelli, was a weak man, and the real head of them soon became Dolcino, who was put to death with his "*Sister Margaretta.*"

The Apostolicals differed from the spiritual Franciscans in having no monasteries and never hoarding up what was given to them, and also in taking on them no vows outwardly, nor were they bound by any outward rule of obedience to any particular class of superiors, but all the members were held together by the free spirit of love. No other bond existed between them but the inner one of the Holy Spirit. Thus did Dolcino set up against the legal spirit and ideas of the spirituals that of gospel liberty. But on the other hand, these Apostolicals stood forth against the Papacy and the dominant Church as worldly and corrupt, and hesitated not to describe it as the Babylon of the Apocalypse. And many of them died at the stake as martyrs for this truth. In fact, all these various tendencies, embodying themselves all in one common assault against the Church, she was, of course, driven to suppress them by fair means or by foul. Augustine (says Neander) had laid the foundation of those principles of ecclesiastical law on which all violent measures against heretics could be justified. Others after him had shaped them out in full length and proportions. The systematic theologians of the thirteenth century had but to build further on the same foundations. The monks (not the Popes, busy with other concerns) were the Church's instruments in this warfare with heresy. In 1198 Innocent III. sends his first *inquisitors* to search out and convince and con-

vert the heretics. But sermons and argument availed nothing; and then commenced the celebrated crusade against the Albigenes, which continued in all its horrors and bloodshed for thirty years.

JNO. B. ADGER.

ARTICLE VII.

HANSEN'S "REFORMED CHURCH IN THE NETHERLANDS."

The Reformed Church in the Netherlands, Traced from A. D. 1340 to 1840 in Short Historical Sketches. By Rev. MAURICE G. HANSEN, A. M. New York: Board of Publication of the Reformed Church in America.

This is the title of a work covering, in brief space, a long period in the history of the Reformed Church. A time of five hundred years is comprised within the compass of a duodecimo of three hundred and thirty pages, and the treatment of the subject is necessarily condensed. While much that might be of interest has to be omitted, something is also gained by a rapid and accurate survey of so long a period of time. History repeats itself, is a maxim which is never more true than when applied to the history of human thought. The same variations, the same errors, the same novelties, tend to reappear from century to century, modified by the spirit of the age, and slightly disguised. But the keen search of historical criticism detects the identity of principles, and drags the masquerading theory into the clear light of truth.

Nor can there be a better discipline for the student of theology and the minister actively engaged in church work, than such a review of some great epoch; or a sketch of some one branch of the Church of Christ. As our author well says in closing his book: "One of the most beautiful illustrations of the exquisite neatness of execution which characterises all the works of the