



Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

Howling -
1838 575



600002384N

35.

515.



A
L E T T E R
TO
THE REV. S. R. MAITLAND,
ON
THE OPINIONS
OF
THE PAULICIANS.

BY
JOHN GOULTER DOWLING, M. A.
OF WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD,
RECTOR OF ST. MARY DE CRYPT, GLOUCESTER.

Quin potius memores simus tam Dominicanarum prænuntiationum, quam Apostolicarum litterarum, quæ nobis et futuras hæreses prænuntiarunt, et fugiendas præfînierunt: et sicut esse illas non expavescimus, ita posse id propter quod fugiendæ sunt, non miremur.

Tertullian. de Præscript. Hæreticorum, IV.

LONDON,
FOR J. G. AND F. RIVINGTON;
J. H. PARKER, OXFORD; J. AND J. J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE;
J. E. LEA, AND T. JEW, GLOUCESTER;
W. STRONG, BRISTOL AND EXETER.

1835.

515.



OXFORD,

PRINTED BY S. COLLINGWOOD, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY.

A LETTER, &c.

MY DEAR SIR,

A CONSCIOUSNESS of our faults is the first stage in the progress towards amendment. It is therefore a very satisfactory symptom to hear from so many different quarters, a full confession of the degraded state of ecclesiastical learning among us. But never certainly was there more substantial ground of complaint. Never, among an intelligent and inquiring people, had an useful and interesting branch of study fallen into more complete neglect. During the last century the cultivation of church history may fairly be said to have been abandoned. We are, I trust, fallen upon a time which will see it resumed with new zeal and vigour.

But to whatever extent ecclesiastical studies are destined again to advance among us, we may certainly boast of having witnessed the foundation of a new English school of church history. It is unnecessary, and it might be invidious, to particularize the labourers. Your station in the number is, however, my dear Sir, by this time ascertained and recognised. The "Facts and Documents" stand in the very highest class of the recent contributions to our knowledge in the province of fact. It is not a

small thing to have cleared at a stroke a field which had been encumbered by the officious industry of the disputants of two centuries. There is now an end of the controversy about the Albigenses. Men of real learning had, it is true, never much doubt about the matter. An acquaintance with one-tenth of the authorities which you have collected, was sufficient to convince the fair inquirer that the Albigenses held Manichæan tenets, and that the Waldenses were a distinct and a recent sect. But it needs not learning to get at the truth *now*. It needs but honesty and plain sense, and the pains of reading your interesting book. That book *must* have its effect, and it seems scarcely possible but that in a very short time you will see Protestantism relieved, by your exertions, of one of its most crying scandals—the attempt to maintain a position which the learned Romanist *knew* to be untenable.

In clearing away the rubbish which a perverse ingenuity and well meaning ignorance had heaped on the field of your labours, you found it necessary to estimate the value of Milner's "History of the "Church of Christ ^a," and to notice the strange

^a The writer of these remarks does not wish them to be considered as put together with reference to the recent controversy about the literary value of Milner's History. That question has surely been quite decided by Mr. Maitland's "Notes." *Τίς ἀλκὴ τὸν θανόντ' ἐπικτανεῖν*; But every one who has the least regard for truth and learning is bound to protest against the attempt to deposit Milner's book in a sanctuary which it shall be sacrilege to violate. A work of forty years standing is surely a fair subject of criticism. The mortifying part of the affair is that it remained so long uncriticized. The best apology for Milner is afforded by the fact that at the time he wrote, and for many years after, there was no one in this coun-

account which he had given of the Paulicians. And truly the want of information and the want of judgment, which that writer displays in his second chapter on the IXth century, are equally astonishing in one who pretended to write on an ecclesiastical subject, and are, it might be thought, amply sufficient to put the most confiding on their guard against depending on him as a writer of church history,—however sound he may have been as a divine, or excellent as a man.

It might have seemed that a writer who, by his own confession, was absolutely without the means of knowing the real state of the case, and who, when he called the Paulicians “servants of Christ,” and celebrated “the Christian patience and meekness” with which they “underwent the horrors of persecution,” knew nothing about the sect but what he read in the most common English books, could effect nothing but the ruin of his own literary character. Yet in this strange paradox he has had his followers. Not to mention more obscure writers, the author of a well known “Life of Wycliffe^b” has

try who could have written such a history better than he did. The learned writers who have lately exposed his deficiencies and errors, are not the men to enter into a wicked crusade against a man of piety, as some seem to insinuate. And every one who knows any thing about the matter, knows that it was not divines of a particular school merely, who in Milner’s time were unacquainted with the original writers of ecclesiastical history. The ignorance was general.

^b Vaughan’s *Life of Wycliffe*, vol. i. p. 110—122. This writer makes two or three references to *Petrus Siculus*, but as all the same places are cited by Mr. Turner, to whom he also refers, and as his account of the Paulicians is evidently compiled from the English writers, I cannot doubt that the refer-

adopted his opinion—himself equally unacquainted with the original testimonies. And even so able an author as Mr. Turner, though he believes “that the Paulicians had many absurd as well as valuable opinions,” seems to regard them upon the whole as reformers rather than heretics.

It might really be thought, from the language of many of these persons, that there was a deficiency of evidence with regard to the opinions and history of the Paulicians, that we have no means of getting at any thing like an accurate acquaintance with their principles and fortunes, and that in the absence of original testimony we may give ourselves up to the guidance of conjecture. Persons unacquainted with Byzantine literature, would be aston-

ences in question were merely transferred from Mr. Turner’s pages—for the sake of *effect*. The unfairness of this way of getting up books, and of seeking by such means as these a reputation for learning, is only to be paralleled by the presumption with which writers who are quite destitute of original information, set up mere conjecture against historical testimony.

Mr. Turner’s remarks (*Hist. of England during the Middle Ages*, vol. v. p. 123—126.) are of a much more superficial character than what has usually proceeded from the pen of that valuable writer. It could be only in the most hurried composition that Mr. Turner would be likely to confound the tyrant Justinian II. with Justinian I. the legislator, as he has done on page 125.

But the most extraordinary misrepresentation I have met with on the subject—and I have met with a pretty large quantity—is contained in the “*History of the Waldenses*, by “the Rev. Adam Blair, Edinburgh, 1833.” This writer communicates the startling information, that Petrus Siculus, or as he classically denominates him, Peter Siculus, was “a prejudiced Romanist.” The account he gives of the tenets of the Paulicians is so marvellously distorted, that I shall insert it in a note, when I come to notice the testimony of the Greek writer whom he professes to follow.

ished to be told that there is in existence a very large quantity of original evidence, that there are two or three ancient treatises extant, written by contemporaries expressly on the subject of the Paulicians, that the sect is more or less noticed^c by almost all the historians of the Romans of the East, and that it is referred to by ecclesiastical documents. And yet this is really the case. We know more of the Paulicians than we know of half the sects^d of which mention is made in the annals of philosophy and religion. And I cannot see that our authorities leave us the slightest reason to doubt the general accuracy of the common statements.

Had it been a difficult thing to expose the erroneous views of the writers to whom I refer, I should have ventured to request you to diffuse upon this branch of history the light which every subject you have treated has received from your profound and extensive acquaintance with ecclesiastical learn-

^c Horum Paulicianorum ortum, progressum, successionem, deliria, furorem, facinora descripserunt auctores multi aut saltem commemorarunt.—Cotelerius, in notis ad Nomocanon. ccc. Eccles. Græc. Monument. tom. i. p. 738. Lut. Paris. 1677. And let me here add the words of another learned modern on the subject before us. “At enim vero quis dubitet, historicis “ad tempora hæc propius accedentibus iisque consentientibus “majorem in hoc negotio fidem adhibendam esse, quam Arnolde “recentiori figmentorum consarcinatori, et conjecturis fallacibus “familiariter utenti?” J. Ch. Wolfii Manichæismus ante Manichæos, cap. lix. p. 247, 248.

^d For instance, the Bogomili, not to mention the early Gnostic sects. Sam. Andreae Disquisitio de Bogomilis; apud Johannis Vogt Bibl. Hist. Hæresiologicæ, tom. i. p. 124. J. Christoph. Wolfii Historia Bogomilorum.

ing, and to follow up the valuable observations which you have made in the third section of the "Facts and Documents," by a general exposition of the evidence with regard to this remarkable sect. But there is no need of a Hercules to perform a common work. There is nothing useful or agreeable in a display of superfluous power. And it requires but ordinary industry and judgment to lay together the testimony of antiquity, with regard to the Paulicians.

No one who knows the connection^e of the Paulicians with the Western heretics of the twelfth century, will deny that it is of importance for us to understand the real nature of their opinions, and to be acquainted with the evidence upon which they are charged with holding Manichæan tenets. I am not aware that the necessary information has ever been brought together. The ordinary reader turns to two well known books. Mosheim^f has represented their principles with his usual accuracy and fairness: Gibbon^g has given an account of their history with his usual prejudices certainly, but with even more than his usual vigour. Among the moderns he will find no better guides. But it was not the object of these learned men, to set forth at length the evidence on which they founded their opinions. And I shall, I believe, be doing what

^e See Maitland's "Facts and Documents illustrative of the History, Doctrine, and Rites of the ancient Albigenses and Waldenses." Section iv. p. 82—93.

^f Institut. Hist. Eccles. sæc. ix. pars ii. cap. v. §. ii—vi. p. 311. et seq. edit. Helmstad. 1764.

^g History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. liv. vol. x. 8vo.

has never been done before^h, in giving an account of the authorities which support the views which have been maintained, with regard to this sect, by nearlyⁱ all the writers of ecclesiastical history.

^h Neither Gibbon, Fleury, nor Ceillier was acquainted with “Photius contra Manichæos repullulantes.” I have met with but one writer who was acquainted with all the evidence—the admirable Mosheim. *Institut. Hist. Eccles. sæc. ix. pars ii. cap. v.* I shall presume—but it will be with reverence—to point out a few inaccuracies even in the account given by this great man.

ⁱ It is but fair to state, that Milner was not the first who attempted to vindicate the Paulicians. The celebrated mystic, Godfrey Arnold, asserted their orthodoxy in his *Ecclesiastical History*. I have not seen his work, which is not in the Bodleian. But Mosheim speaks of him with great severity. “Si, quod omnes fatentur, historici primum hoc munus est, ne quam vel gratiæ vel simultatis suspicionem excitet, hoc certe nemo minus ad historiam scribendam aptus fuit. Nihil enim sentiat et videat necesse est, qui se videre ac sentire negat, Historiam ejus, quam diximus, totam ab animo perturbato et odio communium dogmatum et institutorum ardente dictam esse. Adsciscit autem Arnoldus in *Historia sua* hoc tamquam minime dubium: Omnia quæ in civitatem Christianam post apostolorum tempora irreperunt mala, a sacrorum ministris et præfectis, hominibus vitiosis et improbis veniunt. Quo sumto, concludit: Omnes qui sacerdotibus et sacrorum ministris sese opposuere atque ab illis vexati sunt, viri fuerunt pii et sancti: contra qui sacro ordini placuere, homines fuere devii et a vera pietate aversi. Hinc illa omnium hæreticorum fere, etiam illorum quorum rationes ipse nec perspexerat, nec satis assequebatur, defensio, quæ libro ejus summam invidiam peperit.” *Institut. Hist. Eccles. p. 835. edit. 1764.* Even Beausobre admits that the work of Arnold was “une entreprise au-dessus de ses forces;” and that “l’article des Manichéens est peu de chose, l’auteur n’ayant pas examiné avec assez d’attention l’histoire et les dogmes de Manichée. On voit bien que c’est un morceau fait à la

I cannot help observing in the outset, that it is curious to remark how slowly and gradually the evidence has come to light. The Centuriators derived all they knew from Zonaras, and the continuator of Paulus Diaconus. Baronius must have been acquainted with Cedrenus, and Sirmond translated expressly for his use the part of Petrus Siculus, which he has incorporated in the Annals. In 1604, the Jesuit Raderus edited the Greek text of Petrus, and his Latin translation was subsequently printed in several of the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*. But the very existence of the work of Photius was nearly unknown till it was announced by Zacagni in 1697, and it was not printed till the beginning of the eighteenth century—the first book by Montfaucon in 1715, the whole by John Christopher Wolf in 1722^k. But from the very first, no one doubted that the Paulicians were a Manichæan sect. The Centuriators, with their limited materials,

“*hâte, et par un homme prévenu.*” *Histoire de Manich.* i. 239. It appears also from several places in his “*Histoire Critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme,*” that Beausobre himself intended to write an apologetic history of the Paulicians. The writer of a memoir prefixed to the second volume of that work (p. vi.), which was published after the author’s death, speaks of an “*Histoire des Pauliciens,*” which was to appear among his posthumous works. But I cannot find that it was ever printed. The work of Arnold is in German, with the title, *Kirchen-und Ketzler-Historia von Anfang des Neuen Testaments bis auf das Jahr Christi 1688.* Arnold’s other works on Church History are enumerated by Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* vol. xii. p. 176.

^k By Montfaucon, in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, pars ii. p. 349—375. By Wolf, in the first and second volumes of his “*Anecdota Græca Sacra et Profana.*” *Hamburgi*, 1722.

found no room for doubt. And after the appearance of the work of Petrus, the most sceptical only could suppose that the general accuracy of the account of their opinions, which he gives as the result of his personal observation, could be called into question. The work of Photius, valuable as it is in establishing the heretical character of the sect, when it has once been doubted, when it was first made known to the learned, seems to have been regarded with little interest, as being scarcely needed to confirm what was already so amply established by other evidence.

Instead of giving any fresh account of the opinions usually imputed to the Paulicians, or of transcribing the words of any of the moderns, I shall translate the passage in which they are noticed by Georgius Cedrenus. Though this annalist lived in the latter part of the eleventh century, and must therefore be allowed to be a late writer, he wrote while the Paulicians were still a numerous and flourishing sect. But he is not to be regarded as an original historian. He is, in the most literal sense of the word, a compiler¹. His narrative not

¹ Opus e variis historiis non sentiis solum, sed verbo tenus consarcinatum absolvit. Quæ si ab auctoribus repeterentur, nudus ipse, æque ac cornicula illa remaneret. Primam enim historiæ partem a Georgio Syncello, et Georgio alio, Hamartolo, ad Maximianum et Maximinum; cætera ad Nicephorum ex Genico a Theophane Syncelli continuatore, de Basilio Macedone ex Constantini Porphyrogennetæ libro de Vita et Rebus gestis Basilio Macedonis; a Nicephoro ad Stratioticum ipsum, in quo historiam finit, a Joanne Scylitza exscripsit, et nescio qua fronte pro suis divendit, adeo ut vix unam, alteramve periodum in tam vasto volumine Cedreni propriam ac legitimam reperies. Gratia tamen illi agenda sunt, quod auctores nobis præcipuos et raros suo ipse furto conservavit, quando illi non

merely represents the sense, but is given in the very words of his predecessors. I have found almost all the other places in which he speaks of the Paulicians, nearly word for word in Theophanes and his continuator. And though I have not been able to trace this particular passage, I have little doubt that it belongs to some original writer, who lived within the period of the Macedonian dynasty. But I do not lay any stress on this opinion. I do not now produce Cedrenus as an authority, but as giving, in a more compact form, and at a more moderate length, than the other Greek writers, an account of the Paulician tenets.

“ About this time ^m appeared Constantine, the “ leader (ὁ ἀρχηγός) of the Paulicians, who gave him-
“ self the name of Silvanus. Their heresy is this.
“ They are called Paulicians and Manichæans. They
“ have obtained the name of Paulicians ⁿ, instead of

haberentur. Leonis Allatii de Georgiis Diatriba, apud Fabricii
Bibl. Græc. vol. x. p. 650, 651.

^m The thirteenth of Constans, A. D. 653.

ⁿ There is much difference of opinion among our authorities with regard to the origin of the name, Paulicians. Petrus Siculus seems to think that they were called Paulicians from Paul and John, the sons of Callinice (Hist. de Manichæorum Hæresi, p. 38.), though he afterwards says that they were so called from one of the brothers, Paul, (p. 48.) Photius, after stating that they were called Paulicians from one of the brothers, adds, that some thought the appellation to be a barbarous compound of the names of both, and that it was equivalent to Pauloioannæ, (l. i. p. 5—7.) Zonaras (Annal. xvi. p. 156.) and Anna Comnena (Alexiad. xiv. p. 451.) derive the word, ἐκ Παύλου καὶ Ἰωάννου*. But the opinions which derive the name from the

* Du Cange, annotating on this place of the Alexiad, says,
“ Anna Paulicianos appellatos velle videtur vocabulo ex Paulo
“ et Joanne confecto, quasi Παῦλοι καὶ Ἰάνοι. Sic etiam Zonaras
“ in Michaele.”

“ that of Manichæans, from one Paul of Samosata,
 “ the son of a Manichæan woman of the name of
 “ Callinice. She had two sons, this Paul, and an-
 “ other named John. Having instructed them in the

sons of Callinice, have always appeared to me extremely unsatisfactory. There appears to have been no connection whatever between the Paulicians and these teachers, who were Manichæans of the ancient school, and whom the Paulicians readily anathematized. Photius has incidentally furnished what seems to me to be the real origin of the name. Speaking of Paul, the father of Gegnæsius, he says, that “ *he* was the Paul from whom “ a part of the apostates, and that not the smallest, think that “ the abominable race of the Manichæans derive their name, “ and not from the sons of Callinice.” (Phot. i. 75.) This Paul was one of the few who survived a severe persecution, which took place in the year 686, six years after the death of Constantine Silvanus, and was in fact the reviver of the sect. He was the father of two famous Paulicians, Gegnæsius and Theodorus, the former one of their most distinguished leaders and confessors. The opinion of Gibbon, which Milner has adopted, that they derived the name from St. Paul, was with both these writers purely conjectural. But there happens to be proof, though it has never yet been observed, that they did themselves give this construction to the name. Photius notices their shameless inconsistency in entertaining sentiments so opposed to the plain declarations of St. Paul, *οὗ ψευδεπώνυμοι παραγράφονται*, (lib. ii. p. 190.) *καὶ γὰρ ἐπιγράφονται τοῦτον*, (lib. iii. p. 42.) It was quite natural for them to have given this turn to the name, when it had once been applied to them by the vulgar; (*οἱ καὶ Παυλικιάνοι ἀγροικότερον παρὰ τοῦ δημόδου ὄχλου καλοῦνται*. Zonar. Annal. lib. xvi. tom. ii. p. 156. *ὄς Παυλικιάνους ἢ δημόδου ὀνομάζει φωνή*. Mich. Glycæ Annal. pars iv. p. 335.;) but it is scarcely possible that they could have assumed a name so strangely formed of themselves. Balsamon (Canon. xix. Concil. Nic.), and Matthæus Blastares (Syntagm. Alph.), respectively in Bevereg. Pand. Canon. tom. i. p. 82, and tom. ii. pars ii. p. 11, rather obscure than illustrate the origin of the name.

“ Manichæan heresy, she sent them forth from Samo-
 “ sata into Armenia to preach the heresy. When
 “ they were come to a certain village of Phanarrhœa,
 “ they disseminated their heresy there. From that
 “ time therefore, the name of the village was changed
 “ to Episparis, and their disciples were called Pauli-
 “ cians. At a considerable interval after this Paul,
 “ these people had another teacher called Constan-
 “ tine, who was also named Silvanus. Him they
 “ hold as the founder (*ἀρχηγόν*) of their doctrines,
 “ and not Paul. For he it was who delivered to them
 “ their heresies, not in writing, but by tradition; that
 “ is, the Gospel by tradition^o, the Apostle in writing.
 “ The text he delivered to them unaltered, as we
 “ have it ourselves, but he wrested the several chap-
 “ ters to support his own heresies; and made it a
 “ law to his followers, not to read any book what-
 “ ever besides the Gospel and the Apostle. But after
 “ Constantine Silvanus, they had a second teacher
 “ called Symeon, who changed his name to [Titus;
 “ a third, Genesius, who changed his name^p to] Ti-
 “ mothy; a fourth, Joseph, who changed his name
 “ to Epaphroditus; and after him, Zacharias; but

^o I profess myself unable to understand what he means by saying, that Constantine delivered to his followers “ the Gospel “ by tradition,” as it is quite certain the Paulicians read the whole of the New Testament, which was received as canonical by the church, with the exception of the Epistles of St. Peter. The passage seems to have suffered in transcription. It is likely that the words, *κατὰ παράδοσιν*, have been erroneously repeated from the preceding clause.

^p The words within the brackets are not in Cedrenus—but as they have evidently been omitted by a transcriber, and are necessary to complete the passage, I have supplied them from the next sentence, compared with Photius and Peter.

“ some of them reject this one as a hireling, and not
 “ a true shepherd; a sixth, Baanes, the filthy (τὸν
 “ ῥυπτρόν); and a seventh, Sergius, who also changed
 “ his name to Tychicus. They readily then anathe-
 “ matize Manes, and Paul, and John, and all others
 “ you may mention to them; but Constantine, sur-
 “ named Silvanus, and Symeon, surnamed Titus, and
 “ Genesisius surnamed Timothy, and Joseph surnamed
 “ Epaphroditus, and Baanes the filthy, and Sergius
 “ called Tychicus, they cannot by any means be pre-
 “ vailed upon to anathematize, as being their teach-
 “ ers, but hold them as apostles of Christ.

“ They have six churches in their confession. Ci-
 “ bossa, a town of Colonia, which Constantine called
 “ Silvanus, and Symeon called Titus instructed, they
 “ call Macedonia: Manalis, a village of Samosata,
 “ which Genesisius called Timothy instructed, Achaia:
 “ they call the disciples of Joseph surnamed Epa-
 “ phroditus, and of Zacharias, whom they call the
 “ hireling shepherd, the church of the Philippians:
 “ the Cynochorites, that of the Laodiceans. That of
 “ the Ephesians however, composed of the people of
 “ Mopsuestia, and that of the Colossians, they say
 “ that Sergius, surnamed Tychicus, anathematized⁹.
 “ These seven teachers and six churches they hon-
 “ our and revere. Whatever others you may men-
 “ tion to them, they anathematize and reject.

⁹ The text of Cedrenus is plainly corrupt here. There is no doubt he meant that Sergius *taught* the three churches of the Laodiceans, the Ephesians, and the Colossians, not *anathematized* them. We should read ἐμαθήτευσε, not ἀνεθεμάτισε. Photius makes this evident, Τούτων δὲ τῶν τριῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ τὸ σύστημα καὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν εἰς Σέργιον, τὸν καὶ Τυχικόν, ἀνάπτουσί τε καὶ ἀνατιθέασιν. Phot. Lib. i. p. 16.

“ They hold the prime heresy of the Manichæans,
 “ acknowledging as they do, two principles. They
 “ say, ‘ there is only one thing which separates us
 “ from the Romans, that we say that the heavenly
 “ Father is one God, and has no authority in this
 “ world, but in that which is to come; and that
 “ the Maker of the world is another, and has au-
 “ thority over this present. But the Romans,’ say
 “ they, ‘ acknowledge one and the same God to be
 “ at once the heavenly Father and the Maker of
 “ the universe.’ They call themselves Christians,
 “ but us Romans. To those who know them not
 “ they readily say, we believe on Father, Son, and
 “ Holy Spirit, the heavenly Father; and utter an
 “ anathema against him who does not thus believe—
 “ still carefully and insidiously maintaining their bad
 “ principles. For when they say ‘ the Father of
 “ heaven,’ they do not add, ‘ the only true God, who
 “ made heaven and earth, and all things therein.’
 “ The orthodox when conversing with the Mani-
 “ chæan should ask him to repeat the symbol of the
 “ faith, ‘ I believe in one God, the Father Almighty,
 “ Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visi-
 “ ble and invisible;’ and so forth. But in the next
 “ place they immoderately blaspheme the very holy
 “ mother of God. Whenever they are forced by us
 “ to confess her, they say in words that will bear
 “ another meaning (*ἀλληγορικῶς λέγουσι*); ‘ I believe
 “ on the holy mother of God, into which the Lord
 “ entered and from which he went out.’ But they
 “ mean the Jerusalem above, into which Christ the
 “ forerunner is for us entered, as saith the apostle;
 “ and mean not in truth the holy Mary, mother of
 “ God, nor that the Lord was incarnate of her. But

“ they also blaspheme against the divine mysteries of
 “ the holy communion of the precious body and blood
 “ of our Lord Jesus Christ, saying that the Lord said,
 “ ‘ Take, eat and drink,’ offering his words to the
 “ apostles, and not bread and wine. And they say
 “ that bread and wine ought not to be employed.
 “ They also blaspheme against the precious cross^r,
 “ saying that Christ is the cross, and that we ought
 “ not to worship the cross of wood, inasmuch as it is
 “ an accursed instrument. They reject the prophets
 “ and other holy men^s, and especially revile and ex-

^r As it is evidently the opposition of the Paulicians to the worship of the cross which has procured them the good opinion of most of their modern advocates, it may be as well to remark that the mere fact of their having rejected this practice cannot possibly prove any thing in their favour, since if they held Manichæan or Gnostic tenets they could not do otherwise. Of their dishonouring the Virgin I say nothing, because it is uniformly connected by their opponents with their heretical sentiments with regard to the incarnation. It deserves always to be remembered that these charges *cannot* be resolved into a mere rejection of image-worship, since Leo Isaurus, the first and most determined of the iconoclast emperors, and Leo Armenus, one of the same number, whose character was applauded even by his opponents (Jos. Genesius, lib. i. p. 7. Georgius Cedrenus, Hist. Comp. p. 490.), both undoubtedly persecuted the Paulicians.

^s Milner thinks that the fact that the Paulicians received the writings of St. Paul is a proof of the soundness of their faith with regard to the Old Testament (Hist. of the Church of Christ, vol. iii. p. 204.); forgetting that the ancient Manichæans though they also partially received the New, most certainly rejected the Old Testament, as he himself admits in his account of Augustine, vol. ii. p. 315, note.

In the “History of the Waldenses by William Jones. London, “ 1812,” this feature in the Paulician system is so curiously explained that I cannot forbear making an extract. It is scarcely necessary to observe that this writer is one of the ingenious

“ press an aversion from St. Peter, the great prot-
 “ apostle; saying that no one of them is included
 “ among those that are saved. They designate their
 “ assemblies the Catholic Church, but only when they
 “ speak in their equivocating way (ἐν τῇ ἀλληγορίᾳ
 “ αὐτῶν) to us; for they call them prayer-houses (προσ-
 “ ευχάς) to one another. Baptism they consider to
 “ be the words of the Gospel; according to the saying
 “ of the Lord, ‘I am the living water.’ All these,
 “ and many more than these, tenets when detected
 “ they express in language that will bear another
 “ meaning (ἀλληγοροῦσι). But you must carry on all
 “ your disputes with them prudently and logically
 “ (νουννεχῶς καὶ διωρισμένως). For they have falsehood
 “ at hand as their peculiar law—always indeed, but
 “ especially when they are pressed, speaking falsely,
 “ and affirming what they are commanded and di-
 “ rected to affirm. And by this conduct they incur no

persons who write history without any sort of acquaintance with
 the original sources of information. “ This calumny (that the
 “ Paulicians rejected the whole of the Old Testament writings)
 “ is easily accounted for. The advocates of Popery, to support
 “ their usurpations and innovations in the kingdom of Christ,
 “ were driven to the Old Testament for authority, adducing the
 “ kingdom of David for their example. And when their adver-
 “ saries rebutted the argument, insisting that the parallel did
 “ not hold, for that the kingdom of Christ which is not of this
 “ world, is a very different state of things from the kingdom of
 “ David, their opponents accused them of giving up the divine
 “ authority of the Old Testament. Upon similar principles, it
 “ is not difficult to vindicate the Paulicians from the other
 “ charges brought against them.” P. 280. Most assuredly it
 is not. Upon similar principles Mr. Jones might make out just
 what he pleased. But it is grievous to think what miserable
 trash persons writing upon such principles have put forth as
 ecclesiastical history.

“ blame from one another. For Manes delivered to
 “ them this precept, ‘I am not unmerciful,’ (*ἀσπλαγ-*
 “ *χνος*,) says he, ‘as Christ was, who said, Whosoever
 “ shall deny me, I also will deny him: but I say,
 “ the man that denies me before men, and by the
 “ falsehood effects his own safety, I will receive him
 “ with joy, as if he had not denied me; and I shall
 “ no more call him to account for his denial and
 “ falsehood than as if he had confessed me.’ They
 “ likewise reject our presbyters and other spiritual
 “ persons (*ἱερείς*); they call their own priests Synec-
 “ demi, and Notarii^t; who differ from the rest of
 “ them neither in dress, nor food, nor any other par-
 “ ticular of common life. They pervert all the lan-
 “ guage of the Gospel and the Apostle, so as to bring
 “ out from it a meaning contrary to our belief, and
 “ framed so as to give it an appearance of squaring
 “ with their peculiar heresies. They make no change
 “ in the text and wording, but receive the same as we
 “ do. But they pervert the sense, as I have shewn
 “ more plainly in what I have written at length upon

^t Photius says that they objected to the names “presbyter,”
 and “priest” (*ἱερεύς*), because the priests and elders of the people
 took counsel against Christ. (Lib. i. p. 31.) The word *συνέκδη-*
μος they found in 2 Cor. viii. 19. and Acts xix. 26. Concerning
 the word Notarii J. C. Wolfius has the following remark in his
 note on the place of Photius. “Ex Henr. Valesii ad Socratis
 “ Histor. Ecclesiast. lib. v. c. 22. observationibus patet, Episco-
 “ pos ad manus habuisse eruditos adolescentes, qui et acta ec-
 “ clesiastica exciperent, et, prout res ferebat, instar lectorum,
 “ populo sacras literas prælegerent. Atque hoc nomine Pauli-
 “ ciani illi sacerdotes suos Notarios appellasse videntur.” It is
 proper to remark that by these names the Paulicians distin-
 guished different orders of their hierarchy. Photius, lib. i.
 p. 134.

“ this subject ^v. They sometimes worship our gospel, saying, that ‘ the words of Christ are not in the Cross, but in the Book, and therefore we worship them.’ Yet some of them in time of sickness or suffering lay the cross upon themselves ; and when they have recovered their health, break it, and throw into the fire and burn it, or trample on it. Some of them have their children baptized by our presbyters ; and others, coming into our orthodox church, communicate without being detected, that they may the better deceive those of the simpler sort. Such are the tricks and hypocrisies they employ—and such is their intemperance, that there are scarcely any enormities which they scruple to practise^w.” Hist. Compend. p. 432—435.

Such was the opinion of the Greeks with respect to the sect of the Paulicians. Constantine, who seems to have been its founder, was put to death in 680 ^x. It was persecuted by the emperors Constantine ^y

^v Καθὼς ἐν τοῖς διὰ πλάτος μοι λέλεκται περὶ τούτων σαφέστερον. These words seem to me to afford a strong confirmation of the opinion I have already expressed with regard to this passage. They scarcely leave a doubt that Cedrenus took it from some original work which has not come down to us. Mosheim thought that it was compiled from the work of Petrus Siculus ; “ ex hoc Petro sua Cedrenus sumsisse videtur.” Instit. Hist. Eccles. p. 312. It would be easy to shew that *this* was certainly not the case.

^w Πάση ἀκολασία καὶ μiasμῶ ἑκατέρας ἀνθρώπων φύσεως ἀδιαφόρως καὶ ἀδεῶς χρῶνται. τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς γονεῖς, καὶ μόνον ἐαυτῶν, διαφέρεσθαι λέγουσι.

^x He taught during twenty-seven years. (Photius, i. 67. Petrus Siculus, Hist. p. 44.) This gives us the date of his death.

^y Photius, i. 68. Petrus Siculus, p. 44. But the latter does not name the emperor. Mosheim calls him Constans—a manifest error.

Pogonatus, Justinian^z Rhinotmetus, and Leo^a Isaurus. According to Cedrenus it was treated with some degree of favour by Constantine Copronymus. It was openly tolerated by Nicephorus Logotheta. It was probably the favour of Nicephorus which pointed it out for the severe persecution it met with from his successors, Michael Rhangabus and Leo the Armenian. During the reign of the latter of these princes the Paulicians murdered a bishop and a civil officer who had conducted the persecution in Armenia, and under the protection of the Saracens established themselves in mount Argæus^b. The more tolerant government of the succeeding iconoclast emperors Michael Balbus and his son Theophilus, seems to have drawn them down from their fastnesses, and the commissioners of the regent Theodora were able to boast of having put to death by various means a hundred thousand of the heretics. Driven into rebellion by the violence of this persecution, under Carbeas, who had been an officer of rank in the imperial service, they retired among the Saracens. During the reign of Michael III they made several successful inroads upon the empire, and built Tephric and several other strong places on the

^z Photius, i. 74. Petrus Siculus, p. 48.

^a Photius, i. 77. Petrus Siculus, p. 48. As I shall hereafter notice the passages which record the facts I here mention, I shall not continue the references.

^b The remark of Mosheim, "post hæc bellum paullulum quievisse, Paulicianique ad sedes suas in Græcorum terris revertisse, videntur," sæc. ix. pars ii. cap. v. §. 3, is founded on a mistaken view of this part of their history. The Paulicians had not abandoned the empire. See Photius, lib. i. p. 129. and Petrus Siculus, p. 70. who are our authorities with respect to this transaction.

borders of Armenia. After the death of Carbeas, his son in law and nephew Chrysocheir pursued his policy with spirit and success, and miserably ravaged the Roman provinces in Asia. The brilliant career of Chrysocheir was of no long continuance, he was slain by the troops of the first Basil, and after the death of this able leader, Tephricæ soon yielded to the imperial arms. But the conquered Paulicians seem to have been treated as a nation rather than as a sect. We read no more of persecution. And the military genius of John Tzimisce by removing them into Thrace made them useful subjects of the empire. Alexius Comnenus found them in possession of Philippopolis, and during a winter spent in Thrace sedulously laboured to effect their conversion. The Latin conquerors of Constantinople found them in the same parts. But from that period history is silent respecting the Paulicians.

It is not however my purpose to enter into the^c history of the Paulicians; my object is to shew the grounds we have for believing them to have held Manichæan or Gnostic tenets. In pursuance of this object I shall, in the first place, enumerate the writers whose evidence I am about to produce, and then state and examine the nature and value of the testimony they severally afford on the subject before us.

^c Photius declines entering into minute particulars with regard to the history of the Paulicians, and says, *ἐν οἷς τε τὸ πλεόν ἔσχε, καὶ ἐν οἷς ἀπηνέγκατο τὸ ἦττον, ἄλλης τέ ἐστὶν ὑποθέσεως, καὶ ἰδιάζοντος χρόνου.* Lib. i. p. 138. I would readily make the same promise, if I could think that our contemporaries would feel any interest about a sect whose complete history has never yet been written.

The first writer I shall bring forward will be the celebrated Photius, patriarch of Constantinople. The life of this illustrious prelate belongs to the general history of the church. It will be enough to say here, that his "Account of the revival of the Manichæans^d" was written some time before the year 867, when he was deposed from the patriarchate, and that he tells us that he derived his information from the confessions of the Paulicians who applied to him for baptism.

I shall next notice the testimony of Petrus Siculus, who wrote his "History^e" about 870, and who informs us that he collected the account with which he supplies us of the Paulicians, during a residence of nine months at Tephrike, the capital of the insurgent sect.

I shall then give a brief account of the article "against the Paulicians" in the Panoplia of Euthymius Zigabenus, and notice some other writers against the Paulicians who exist in MS.

And after having exhibited the language of the

^d The title of the Hamburg MS. is, *Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀγιωτάτου Φωτίου διήγησις περὶ τῆς Μανιχαίων ἀναβλαστήσεως*. That of the Coislin MS. *Φωτίου τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐν συνόψει διήγησις τῶν νεοφαντῶν Μανιχαίων ἀναβλαστήσεως*.

^e *Petri Siculi Historia ex MS. Codice Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ Græce cum Latina versione edita per Matthæum Raderum e Societate Jesu. Ingolstadii, 1604.* The Greek title is, *Τοῦ αὐτοῦ Πέτρου Σικελιώτου Ἱστορία περὶ τῆς κενῆς καὶ ματαίας τῶν Μανιχαίων τῶν καὶ Παυλικιανῶν λεγομένων*. This is the only edition of the Greek text, which is in a miserably corrupt state, having been edited from a single MS. Raderus, who might have done much more than he has done, without incurring the charge of licentious criticism, seems to have thought it necessary to print the text just as he found it. He has given a few conjectures in the margin.

formula in which the church required the Paulicians to anathematize their errors when they applied for baptism, I shall lastly refer to all the places I have met with, in which mention is made of the Paulicians by the Byzantine historians.

It appears from the work itself that the *Narrative*^f of *Photius* was written about 866, when the Paulicians were in their greatest prosperity. It is comprised in the first of the author's four books "against the Manichæans," and in fact forms an independent work. The author thus explains his object in writing it:

"As I perceive that it is unknown to many
 " whence this abominable and recent sect of the
 " Paulicians received its name, and that various and
 " discordant opinions regarding it generally prevail,
 " I deemed it not unseasonable to notice on this
 " subject, in a popular and concise discourse §, some
 " brief particulars—both those which I have heard
 " from the persons who have renounced and washed
 " away the pollution of the apostasy with the tears
 " of repentance, and whatever other points there

^f I say the *narrative*, as the other books were written later. It is plain that the first book was written while the author was engaged in the duties of the patriarchate, from the concluding words. He promises to continue the subject *ἂν ἄρα τὸν γράφοντα τῆς πολλῆς συνοχῆς ἀνοχὴν ἢ φιλάνθρωπος ἰδεῖν παρασκευάσει καὶ θεία εὐμένεια*, "if the indulgent favour of God should allow the writer
 " a remission from his manifold engagements." As Photius was deposed Sept. 25, 867, and not restored till 877, it could not have been written later than the date I have placed in the text.

§ *Καθωμιλημένῳ καὶ συντόμῳ λόγῳ*. From this, and several other expressions, it appears that the first three books of Photius were addressed to a public assembly.

“ may be in which these moderns have made any
 “ change or addition with regard to the ancient
 “ opinions of the followers of Manes ^h.”

He then tells the story of the sons of Callinice ⁱ— notices the revival of Manichæism by Constantine of Mananalis—deduces the succession of the Paulician teachers, and enumerates their six churches ^k. He next enters upon an exposition of the tenets of the sect, when he states that they acknowledged two principles, and denied that God the Father of heaven was the Creator of the world: that they dishonoured the Virgin, denied the real incarnation of Christ ^l, rejected the communion, and refused to worship the cross: that they rejected the Old Testament, regarded with disrespect the ancient (Jewish) saints, reviled Peter as a traitor, and refused to

^h Photius, lib. i. p. 1—3.

ⁱ Photius, lib. i. p. 3—7. It was long before I could satisfy myself as to the cause of the constant introduction of these persons into the history of the Paulicians. The orthodox writers admit (as I have remarked before, p. 13. note ⁿ.) that Paul and John were Manichæans of the ancient school, and that they were held in no esteem by the Paulicians. Why then are they always connected with them? The most probable supposition seems to be, that the earliest opponents of the Paulicians traced the opinions of Manes to Constantine through these men; and that when their names had been once introduced into the history, they afforded such a convenient etymology for the name of the Paulicians, that they were carefully, though not very critically, retained by the Greek controversialists and historians.

^k Photius, lib. i. p. 7—17.

^l He adds however, that when they were hard pressed, they would sometimes admit, that though Christ brought down with him his body from above, *δι' αὐτῆς ὡς διὰ σωλήνος διεληλυθέναι*, p. 21. This, as it is well known, was the language of the Valentinians and other Gnostic sects.

receive his two epistles: that they set up **their own** assemblies as the Catholic church, rejected **baptism**, refused to admit the priesthood of the church, and called their own priests **Synecdemi** and **Notarii**: that they were an intemperate and profligate sect, whose life was as bad as their doctrines ^m.

He then enumerates the principal ancient writers against the Manichæans, and relates the history of the founders ⁿ of the sect, chiefly following Cyril of Jerusalem. After that he explains the origin of the Paulicians in an account of the rise and ministry of Constantine, and traces their history through the lives of their principal teachers to his own time ^o.

The second ^p book is a homily against the doctrine of the two principles ^q, or rather against the

^m Photius, lib. i. p. 17—34.

ⁿ Ib. p. 34—60.

^o Ib. p. 61—141.

^p Ib. lib. ii. p. 142—216.

^q Mosheim remarks that Photius (lib. ii. p. 148.) supposes the Paulicians to have believed the evil being to have originated from darkness and fire, and on this article he points out what he conceives to be a distinction between them and the ancient Manichæans. (Institut. Hist. Eccles. p. 305.) I am by no means persuaded of the correctness of this distinction. It is, to say the least, extremely uncertain whether any of the Dualistic sects went farther than it appears the Paulicians did. Beausobre maintains of Manes, “ Son erreur capitale, et l’origine de toutes ses erreurs, c’est d’avoir supposé, dans une matière éternelle, le mouvement, la vie, et le sentiment.—Il est certain, qu’il n’a reconnu qu’un seul Dieu, qu’un seul Etre souverainement parfait, quoiqu’il ait été assez aveugle, pour donner à la matière l’existence par soi-même, qui n’appartient qu’à Dieu.” Histoire de Manich. vol. i. p. 495, 496. See also Lardner’s Credibility, part ii. ch. lxiii. §. 7. Works, vol. iii. p. 460—465. 8vo. 1788. Professor Baur of Tübingen seems to me to exhibit the real state of the case when he says, “ In der That unterscheidet sich daher der Manichäische Dualismus von jedem andern eine Hyle von Gott unterscheidenden System nur da-

opinion that the visible creation was the work of the evil principle. It is an able and scriptural argument against this monstrous tenet. Towards the end the author also briefly combats the notion that the Mosaic law derived its origin from the power of evil. In a spirited peroration he exhorts against immoral practices, and promises to continue his refutation of the apostasy by testimonies of scripture.

The third book ^r is an eloquent and powerful discourse in defence of the Divine origin of the Old Testament: it contains a few occasional strokes at the doctrine of the two principles—the foundation of the Manichæan system. The testimonies of scripture are chiefly taken from the writings of St. Paul, with which the writer appears to have been admirably familiar.

The fourth book is a letter ^s or dissertation addressed “durch, dass es dem Begriff der Hyle eine poetische und mythische Gestaltung gibt.” p. 39. Das Manichäische Religionssystem von Dr. F. C. Baur. Tübingen, 1831. Mosheim’s views are well expounded and defended by Walch, *Historie der Kezereien*, vol. i. p. 746, 747.

^r The third book is still more evidently than the foregoing one in the homiletic form. Wolfius says in a note on the opening passage, “Ex limine hoc sermonis patere videtur, eum pro concione habitum fuisse ad audientes, quos scilicet hic ad attentionem iis verbis excitat, quæ ad legentes non æque bene accommodari possunt. Hujus rei vestigia et infra occurrent, quemadmodum et in fine hujus libelli diserte mentio fit τῆς δμιλίας.” Indeed in the course of the piece he distinctly alludes to an audience, ὃ φιλόθεον θεάτρον. (iii. 99.)

^s It has been questioned whether this letter was written during the writer’s first or second deposition from the patriarchal chair. Wolf thinks it was written during the second, that is, between 886 and his death in 891. But he appears not to have been aware that in his epistle to the emperor Basil (epist. 97. p. 136—140. edit. Montacutii, Londini, 1651.), Pho-

dressed to an ecclesiastic of the name of Arsenius, who had requested the author to allow him to peruse his discourses against the Manichæans. Photius tells him that he had been deprived of those papers with his other books, but that as his correspondent stood in need of a refutation of the tenets of the apostates, he would again go through the argument^t. As the introduction leads us to expect, the subjects are for the most part the same as those treated in the preceding books, and many of the same proofs are also repeated. It adds nothing to the information respecting the peculiar tenets of the Paulicians.

Such then is the testimony of Photius. It would be idle to point out the opportunities he enjoyed of becoming acquainted with the truth. It would be still more idle to panegyricize his industry and learning. I shall merely observe that while throughout his treatise, or rather treatises, he uniformly represents the Paulicians as holding Manichæan opinions,

tius expressly complains of having been deprived of his books, a fact that leads me to assign it to the period of his first exile, between 867 and 877.

^t It will be interesting to hear him speak for himself. Ἐπεὶ οὖν τοὺς λόγους ἐκείνους εἰς γραφὴν ἀναληφθέντας ἐπεζήτησας, ἡδ' ἀρπαγὴ τῶν βιβλίων κακείνοις ὑπερόριον ζημίαν ἐπέβαλε, καὶ οὐ πάρεστι τὸ συνταγματίον· τῶν δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ κατατεταγμένων προηγουμένη σε χρεία κατέχει· ὅσα διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν καὶ ἀποστολικῶν ῥημάτων τῆς Μανιχαϊκῆς ἀποσπάδος πρόρριζον τὴν βλάστην ἐκτέμνει ταῦτα, καθόσον οἶόν τέ ἐστιν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἡ τοῦ καιροῦ συγχωρεῖ βαρύτης, καθυποβάλλοντες ἐκδόσει, ἐν τούτοις γὰρ οἶμαι περιγράφεται σου καὶ τὸ αἴτημα, τῇ σῇ διεπεψάμεθα ὁσιότητι. Καὶ εἰ μὲν εὖροις, ὡς ἤλπισας, τῆς σῆς ἂν εὐχῆς εἶη, καὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν πίστιν αἰτήσεως ἡ ἐνέργεια. Εἰ δὲ τὰς ἐλπίδας ἐκνικήσει τὸ ἀδόκητον, τοῦτο δὴ ταῖς τε συνεχέσις ἀρρώστιας, αἷς οὐ λήγει παρενοχλοῦν ἡμῶν τὸ σωματίον, καὶ τῇ τοῦ καιροῦ λογίζου χαλεπότητι. Photius, lib. iv. p. 112—115.

he does not make a single remark that can lead us to suppose that they themselves disclaimed the Dualistic principle.

Petrus Siculus^u addresses his history^x to the archbishop of the Bulgarians. He writes to this

^u I can find nothing respecting Peter the Sicilian beyond what he tells us himself, except the conjecture of the Bollandists, who suppose him to have been the same person with Petrus Argivus, a bishop of Argos. “Qui anno ii Basili Macedonis, Christi 868, Timbricam, Armeniæ civitatem, pro captivorum permutatione legatus, novemque isthic menses moratus, scripsit de Manichæorum, quos isthic didicerat, erroribus librum. Acta Sanctorum, de S. Agath. xiii. 105. 5 Febr. i. 611.

^x As the embassy of Petrus is assigned by the writer himself (p. 72.) to the second of Basil, A. D. 868*, and as his work was evidently written immediately after his return from his nine months' residence at Tibrice, we may fairly conclude that it belongs to the year 869. It has been doubted whether Photius or Petrus were the earlier writer. “Non possum non significare dubitationem, quam in notis meis professus sum, et in qua me adhuc hæere fateor, uter scilicet horum alterum in scribendo imitatus videatur.—Ætatis investigatio hic rem non confecerit. Fuerunt enim æquales, et sæculo ix. medio claruerunt.” Wolfius in præfat. Anecdot. Græc. tom. i. This question I cannot but think decided by the considerations I have produced in note f, p. 24. The historical part of Photius must have been written before Sept. 867. Montfaucon has disregarded the chronology altogether, when he says of the first book of Photius, “Hujus vero narrationis pars maxima, ut plurimum desumpta videtur ex Historia de ortu, progressu, et occasu Manichæorum a Petro Siculo descripta.” Bibliotheca Coisliniana, pars ii. p. 349. And Walch most uncritically says of them, “Die einander scheinen ausgeschreiben zu haben.” Historie der Kezereien, vol. i. p. 688.

* It is evidently by an oversight that Mosheim has stated 870 to have been the date of this embassy. “Petrus hic, quod ipse testatur, A. DCCCLXX. sub Basilio Macedone legatus Tibricam ad Paulicianos missus est.”

prelate in a strain of great humility, disclaiming all pretensions to correctness and eloquence, and informing him that his object in writing was to put him on his guard against the attempts of the heretics, who, as he had learned from themselves, were intending to send a mission into Bulgaria. These Paulicians, he says, “are the same as the Manichæans, whose impurities they disclaim, but whose doctrines they carefully hold and defend.” He had been sent at the commencement of the reign of the emperor Basil to the parts which they inhabited to negotiate an exchange of prisoners. In the discharge of his commission he had spent a considerable time at Tibrice, where by frequent disputations with the heretics themselves, and by careful inquiries among the Catholic inhabitants, he had made himself acquainted with all their secret opinions.

After a desultory introduction, in which he traces the origin of all heresies to the wiles of the Devil striving to counteract what Christ has done for man’s salvation, he states the principal heads of the heresy of the Paulicians in six particulars^y. 1st,

^y “In the ninth century when Peter wrote, he says their principles were, 1st, That there is one supreme God, and another God who introduced sin. Some foes have explained this in the Manichæan sense, but Peter never charges them with Manichæism here. 2dly, That the Virgin Mary does not deserve divine adoration. 3dly, That there are three persons in one God, and that Jesus became incarnate. They believe the other Christian doctrines, but refuse the conversion of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, which was beginning to be hinted by some when Peter wrote. 4thly, That the sign of the cross is to be contemned, and is a ground of their separation: 5thly, That the Scriptures are to be read, and the Pope is not supreme. They did not deny, though

They asserted that there are two principles of things, and that the Maker and Governor of this world is not the same being as the Maker and Governor of the world to come. 2dly, They denied that honour is due to the Virgin, as Christ was not born of her, but brought his body down from heaven. 3dly, They rejected the Eucharist. 4thly, They dishonoured the cross. 5thly, They rejected the Old Testament, and called the prophets deceivers and robbers; they added the epistles of Sergius^z, one of their teachers, to the books of the New Testament which they received, and rejected the two Epistles of Peter. And 6thly, They refused to allow the ministry of the priesthood of the church^a.

He then transcribes the whole passage of the sixth catechesis of Cyril of Jerusalem^b, in which that father gives an account of the history and doctrines of Manes and his predecessors^c. He says

“ they might not possess, the Old Testament. 6thly, That “ there is no ground for the different orders of clergy in the “ Roman church, and that pastors are fellow-pilgrims.” Blair’s History of the Waldenses, vol. i. p. 169, 170. I merely observe on this passage, that Mr. Blair represents Petrus Siculus to say *what he does not say*. The laws of modern controversy do not always allow us to call things by their right names, and if I were to characterize such conduct as this, I should be accused, with honest Peter, of writing with “ prejudice and passion.” But contempt for manifest ignorance ought not to absorb the “ *libera indignatio*” which should ever be felt at the detection of fraud.

^z In the latter part of the treatise also he seems to indicate that Sergius was regarded as an inspired person, when he says that his disciples addressed him as the Paraclete, p. 54.

^a Petrus Siculus, p. 16—20.

^b Cyril. Hieros. p. 100—110. ed. Benedict. Toultée. Paris. 1720.

^c Petrus Siculus, p. 20—34.

that Paul and John^d, inhabitants of Samosata, having been instructed in the Manichæan errors by their mother Callinice, diffused them in Armenia. But the founder of the Paulicians was Constantine^e. Of this teacher he gives the same account as Photius^f, namely, that having been brought up among the Manichæans, he received the volumes of the Gospel and the Epistles of St. Paul as a present from a deacon, whom he entertained upon his return from a captivity in Syria at his residence at Mananalis—that perceiving the unpopularity of the Manichæan writings, and the possibility of defending his heretical opinions by distorting passages of scripture, he threw away his Manichæan books, and taught his followers to read no other book than the New Testament. Our author then continues the history of this new sect to the time of his residence at Tibrice^g. There is nothing in his narrative which can lead us to form a favourable opinion of the Paulicians^h; nor is there any thing which would

^d Petrus Siculus, p. 36.

^e *Ib.* p. 40.

^f As I have shewn that Photius could not have copied the Sicilian, and as I cannot help thinking that if the latter had seen the work of the patriarch, he would have noticed several particulars which he has omitted, I know not how to account for the similarity which appears in some parts of the two narratives, but by supposing the writers to have consulted some common document. The authenticity of their respective works is not in the least degree affected by this hypothesis, as they both claim for themselves the character of independent testimonies. They had both satisfied themselves by their own inquiries of the value of what they respectively derived from the common source.

^g Petrus Siculus, p. 44—74.

^h I have taken no notice of the charges of licentiousness of practice which are brought against the Paulicians by Photius

induce us to think that he has not fairly stated the result of his acquaintance with them. The violent language which he sometimes employs is but in the accustomed and authorized manner of ancient controversy.

*Euthymius Zigabenus*ⁱ, a monk of Constantinople, wrote his “Panoplia Dogmatica Orthodoxæ Fidei” at the command of Alexius Comnenus, within the first few years of the twelfth century^j. This work is compiled from the writings of the most celebrated divines^k of the eastern church. The article^l against the Paulicians is taken entirely from the work of Photius which has been already noticed. The writer copies verbatim the early part of the

and Petrus, more particularly the latter. The declamatory charges of controversial writers deserve to go for little. And it must be confessed that, though such charges were often urged against the Gnostic and Manichæan sects, it is not easy to reconcile them with the genius of the Oriental systems.

ⁱ He survived the emperor, who died in 1118. It appears from Anna Comnena, that he was a favourite with the imperial family.

^j Πανοπλία δογματική τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως, ἤτοι ὄπλοθήκη δογμάτων. The Latin translation of Pet. Fran. Zinus has been frequently printed, and the Greek text was printed at Tergovist in Wallachia in 1710. But my acquaintance with the original was derived from bishop Fell’s MS., which is preserved in the Bodleian—as the Bodleian does not possess the Tergovist edition. There is some curious information about this edition and various MSS. of the Panoplia in Fabricius. Biblioth. Græc. vol. vii. p. 461. et seqq.

^k Principally, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, the Gregories, John of Damascus, and Maximus the Confessor.

^l Τίτλος κα’. κατὰ τῶν λεγομένων Παυλικιάνων ἐκ τῶν Φωτίου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. But in the Πίναξ at the beginning of the MS. it is numbered κδ’.

first book ^m, and extracts and abridges the two following. As this is the case, he cannot of course be produced as an independent testimony. I would merely remark that his work proves that at the beginning of the twelfth century, when the controversy with the Paulicians had been revived under the auspices of the emperor, the orthodox writers had discovered no reason to change the opinion which had been entertained by their predecessors with regard to this sect.

The "Thesaurus Orthodoxæ Fidei" of *Nicetas Choniates* ⁿ, which exists in MS. in the Bodleian and several other libraries, has an article "against the Paulicians." But it is unnecessary to trace the evidence in a writer of the thirteenth century.

There is reason to believe that a work of much greater importance with regard to the opinions of the Paulicians, exists among the treasures of the Vatican. In the catalogue of the Greek MSS. belonging to the library of Heidelberg ^o, Possevin mentions a work of *Metrophanes* archbishop of Smyrna, comprised in four books, three of which relate to the "recens exorta Manichæorum hære-

^m From "Σαμώσαρα" on p. 3, to "περιέπονσι" on p. 34, of the first volume of the *Anecdota Græca*. Wolfius has observed that Euthymius takes no notice of the fourth book.

ⁿ Nicetas Choniates held several high offices at Constantinople, when it was taken by the Latins in 1204. His *Θησαυρὸς ὀρθοδοξίας* was written after that event. He was living in 1216. He is chiefly known as an historian: and is indeed one of the principal authorities for Byzantine history from 1118 to 1206. There is an ample account of his "Thesaurus" in Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græc.* vol. vi. p. 418. et seq.

^o The Palatine library was removed to Rome when Heidelberg fell into the hands of the imperialists in the thirty years' war.

“ sis p.” Metrophanes flourished between 858 and 880, and was one of the most conspicuous ecclesiastics of his time. But though he was a violent opponent of Photius, the title of his work is a sufficient proof of his entertaining the common opinion respecting the Paulicians.

It is well known that by the penitential discipline of the ancient church, the heretic or schismatic who sought restoration to its communion was required publicly to anathematize his errors and confess the truth. The heretics of the graver kind, who were, or whom the church regarded as, unbaptized, could be admitted among her children only by the administration of the initiatory sacrament ^q. Of this kind were the Paulicians. The council of Trullo^r expressly enacted that the Manichæans should be admitted to the church by baptism.

Now we have in our hands the very formula in which the Paulician renounced his errors when he applied for admission to the church. Cotelerius, in a note on the 27th chapter of the Clementine Recognitions, and Tollius, in his “*Insignia Itinerarii Ita-*

p “*Monendus lector est Antonium Possevinum in calce Apparatus Sacri, ubi exstat Catalogus MSS. Græc. Bibliothecæ Heidelberg. p. 81. recensere Metrophanis, archiepiscopi Smyr-nensis, commentationem libris quatuor comprehensam, quorum I. brevem et luculentam narrationem sistat de recens exorta Manichæorum hæresi: II. excerpta ex diversis ejus homiliis contra eosdem Manichæos: III. secundam ejus editionem contra Manichæorum recens prognatum errorem, ad Antonium Metropolitanam Cyzicenum: IV. denique librum de Spiritus S. mystagogia.*” Wolfii præfatio ad *Anec. Græc.* tom. ii.

^q Bingham. *Origin. Eccles.* book xix. ch. 2. §. 8. Vol. ii. p. 249. fol. 2.

^r *Concilium Quinisextum.* Canon xcvi. Labbe, tom. vi. 1183.

“ lici,” have published the anathematismus, or “ form
 “ in which the converted Manichæan anathematized
 “ his heresy, when he came over to the holy catholic
 “ and apostolic church of God^r”. In this document,
 which seems to have been composed in the ninth
 century, the convert renounces the errors which the
 writers that have been examined ascribe to the Pau-
 licians. After anathematizing by name the teachers
 and churches of his sect, he proceeds thus :

“ Anathema to those who say that the Father is
 “ not the Almighty Maker of heaven and earth, and
 “ of all things that are in them both visible and in-
 “ visible; but only the Father of heaven, having
 “ merely authority over the world to come, inas-
 “ much as that the present state (*αιῶνος*), and all
 “ the world, were not made by him, but by his ad-
 “ versary the evil one, the ruler of the world.

“ Anathema to those who insult the holy Mary,
 “ mother of God, pretending to honour her, whereas
 “ they mean instead of her the Jerusalem above,
 “ into which, they say, the Lord entered, and from
 “ which he went out: and who revile the venerable
 “ cross, pretending to reverence it, whereas they
 “ mean instead of it Christ, who, they say, with his
 “ hands extended formed the figure of a cross: and
 “ who reject the communion of the precious body
 “ and blood of Christ, feigning to receive it, whereas
 “ they mean instead of it the words of the doctrine

^r Cotelerius gives merely the “ Anathematismus.” *Patres Apost.* vol. i. p. 537—539. ed. 1698. Tollius gives the “ Ana-
 “ thematismus,” less perfect however than his predecessor, with
 the form of making the convert a catechumen, the exorcisms,
 and nearly the whole of the office of baptism. *Insignia Itinerar.*
Ital. p. 126—177.

“ of Christ, which, they say, he spoke when communicating to the apostles, ‘Take, eat and drink:’ and who express a detestation of baptism, pretending to value it greatly, whereas they mean instead of it Christ, who, they say, said, I am the living water: and who reject the catholic church, saying that they honour it, whereas they mean instead of it, their own conventicles and assemblies.”

Such were the terms in which the church in a most solemn service^s expressed her opinion of the

^s It is so delightful to find the spirit of prayer existing in the church in times which it has been so much the fashion to represent as wrapped in utter darkness and ignorance, and to trace the *communion of saints* among “the prostrate Greeks,” who, we are told, “were content to fast, to pray, and to believe,” that I cannot forbear translating a few of the prayers of this office.

When the convert has made his abjuration by himself or his sponsor, the bishop (*ὁ ἱερεὺς*) offers the following prayer:

“ O God, who art great and of a great name; who didst enlighten the former darkness by the word of thy mouth; who didst send thy only-begotten Son into the world as a propitiation for our sins; who sittest above the cherubim, and art glorified by the seraphim, to whom every knee doth bow of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and every tongue shall confess: O everlasting King, who didst gather the sheep that had gone astray into the flock of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who dost turn the sinner from the error of his way—turn also this thy servant from the darkness of the adversary to the light eternal! Recall him from the error of the Devil to the godly knowledge of thy only-begotten Son! Establish him in the faith, strengthen his heart in faith, in love of thy Christ! Vouchsafe him a part and lot in thy church! For thou art our God, we know none else but thee. We make mention of thy name; that always and in all things thou our God mayest be blessed, and thy only-begotten Son, and thy holy Spirit, now, and ever, and to endless ages! Amen.” Tollius, p. 150.

tenets of the Paulicians. If their tenets were not such as are here anathematized, to exact such a re-

Upon admitting the convert among the catechumens, the bishop offers this prayer, laying his hand upon his head.

“ In thy name, O Lord God of truth, and in the name of thy
 “ only-begotten Son, and of the Holy Ghost, I lay my hand
 “ upon this thy servant, who hath been thought worthy to flee
 “ for refuge to thy holy name, and to be defended under the
 “ covering of thy wings. Remove from him that his ancient
 “ error, and fill him with thy faith, and hope, and charity, that
 “ he may know that thou art the only true God, and thy only-
 “ begotten Son, and the Holy Ghost. And grant him to walk
 “ in all thy commandments, and to observe the things that please
 “ thee, (for if a man do them, he shall live in them,) and inscribe
 “ him in thy book of life, and unite him to the flock of thy in-
 “ heritance; and let thy holy name be glorified upon him, and
 “ the name of thy beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and of
 “ thy enlivening Spirit. And let thy eyes always be intent
 “ upon him continually in mercy, and thy ears to hear the
 “ voice of his supplication. And make him glad in all the
 “ works of his hands, and in all his generation, that he may
 “ confess thee, worshipping thee, and glorifying thy name which
 “ is holy, and great, and very high; and may praise thee conti-
 “ nually all the days of his life: for all the powers of heaven
 “ sing thy praise!” Tollius, p. 152—154.

A prayer at the beginning of the baptismal service.

“ O Lord Jehovah, who didst make man after thine own
 “ image and likeness, and didst impart to him everlasting life;
 “ and when he had fallen by sin didst not disregard him, but
 “ didst effect (*οικονομήσας*) the salvation of the world by the in-
 “ carnation of thy Christ; deliver this thy creature from the
 “ bondage of the enemy, and receive him into thy heavenly
 “ kingdom; open the eyes of his understanding that the light of
 “ thy gospel may shine upon him; unite his life to an angel of
 “ light, that may deliver him from every snare of the adversary,
 “ and every stroke of ill: remove from him every evil and un-
 “ clean spirit, concealed and lurking in his heart, the spirit of
 “ error, the spirit of evil, the spirit of idolatry and of all covet-
 “ ousness, the spirit of falsehood and of all uncleanness that
 “ worketh after the teaching of the Devil; and make him a

nunciation was both absurd and impious. The sentiments renounced are all of a Gnostic character, so that if the convert had never entertained Gnostic sentiments, in this document he renounced nothing. And it is surely to be grievously wanting towards the orthodox in that charity in which some abound so greatly towards the heretics, to suppose that the church would incorporate in her *Formularies* what was known to be but foul misrepresentation and slander.

I have now arrived at the last part of the evidence which I promised to notice—the information which is communicated respecting the Paulicians, by the civil historians of the empire. And here we shall have to observe that from the time they are first mentioned, these writers uniformly hold the same language—whenever they describe them at all, they describe them as Manichæans.

As I intend to bring forward the Byzantine Historians[†] who mention the Paulicians in the order

“reasonable sheep of the holy flock of thy Christ, an honour-
“able member of thy church, a sanctified vessel, a son of light,
“and an heir of thy kingdom. That having lived according to
“thy commandments, and kept the seal unbroken, and pre-
“served his garment undefiled, he may attain to the blessedness
“of thy saints in thy kingdom!” Tollius, p. 160.

Then follow the renunciations*, the profession of obedience, and the confession of faith, with the rest of the office.

[†] In quoting these writers I uniformly refer to the Paris edition of the “*Scriptores Historiæ Byzantinæ*”—before the Benedictines achieved still greater wonders, the glory of French learning. I have not noticed the names of the particular editors, which may be seen in the “*Brevis Conspectus Corporis*

* See Bingham, book xi. chap. viii, and the excellent work of Mr. Palmer, “*Antiquities of the English Ritual*,” vol. ii. p. 176. et seq.

in which they wrote, the first I have to notice is *Theophanes*^u. This writer has in his “Chronographia” continued the annals of the empire from the first of Diocletian, A. D. 285—where Georgius Syncellus ended—to the first of Leo the Armenian, A. D. 813. He first mentions the Paulicians under the fifteenth year of Constantine Copronymus, A. D. 756; where he merely records their introduction into Europe^x.

Under the ninth year of Nicephorus, A. D. 811, he says of that prince that “he was an ardent friend of the Manichæans, now called Paulicians and Athingani, who had been his neighbours in Phrygia and Lycaonia, (where he was born,) being pleased with their oracles^y and rites. These people received permission under his reign to live in security; and many of the lighter sort were perverted by their unlawful opinions^z.”

“*Historiæ Byzantinæ*” in Fabricius. *Bibl. Græc.* vol. vi. p. 221—227. A complete copy of this magnificent edition merits the competition of universities and princes, and, until the German edition projected by Niebuhr is completed, the private student may not aspire beyond the very inferior Venetian.

^u Theophanes, distinguished as “the confessor” from a large number of writers who bore the same name, is celebrated as a sufferer in the cause of the images; he died about the year 817, and has been canonized. Joannes Scylitzes in the valuable preface to his history, which has been printed by Montfaucon in the *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, p. 207, calls him *ὁ ὁμολογητῆς Θεοφάνης*.

^x Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Κωνσταντῖνος Σύρου τε, καὶ Ἀρμενίους, οὓς ἤγαγεν ἀπὸ Θεοδοσιουπόλεως, καὶ Μελιτινῆς, εἰς Θράκην μετόκησεν, ἐξ ὧν ἐπληθύνθη ἡ αἵρεσις τῶν Παυλικιανῶν. *Theophanis Chronographia*, p. 360.

^y Χρησμοῖς καὶ τελεταῖς αὐτῶν ἐπιχαίρων. It would seem from several anecdotes preserved by the contemporary historians, that popular predictions were greatly in vogue at this period.

^z *Theophanis Chronographia*, p. 413.

His account of the circumstances which attended the commencement of the persecution under Michael Rhangabe, that led to the first rebellion of the Paulicians, it would be wrong not to give entire. “The very pious emperor moved with great zeal for God against the Manichæans, who are now called Paulicians and Athingani, and dwell in Phrygia and Lycaonia, having pronounced sentence of death against them at the request of Nicephorus the very holy patriarch, and of other pious men, was diverted by the councils of other evil-minded persons, on the plea of their repentance, when it was impossible for those taken in that error to repent. But they ignorantly pretended that it was not lawful for spiritual persons^a to pass sentence of capital punishment on the impious; being directly at variance on this point with the holy Scriptures. For if Peter, the chief of the apostles, put to death Ananias and Sapphira for a single falsehood, and the great Paul cries aloud that those who do such things are worthy of death; and this for only bodily sin; are they not at variance with them who deliver from the sword those who both in soul and body are full of uncleanness, and belong to the worship of demons? Nevertheless the pious emperor Michael cut off not a few of them^b.”

Georgius Hamartolus composed a Chronicle from the creation to the beginning of the reign of Michael III. (about 842.) His work remains in manuscript^c. But it appears from an extract which

^a μὴ ἐξείναι ἱερεῦσι.

^b Theophanis Chronographia, p. 419, 420.

^c It is singular that it has not been printed—seven MSS.

has been given to the public by Leo Allatius in his "Diatriba de Georgiis," that this writer gives an account of the Paulicians, whom he calls **Manichæans**, and represents as having originated the errors of the iconoclasts^d.

are known to be in existence, and have actually been examined, and Leo Allatius had translated and prepared it for publication. "Chronicon et ipse scripsit ab exordio mundi ad Michaellem Theophili filium, quando ipse vitam agebat, ex variis et diversis chronographis, et interpretibus sacris contextum; historia quidem non admodum opulentum, sed ad firmanda fidei capita, dissertationibus, et sanctorum patrum auctoritatibus longiusculum. Pleraque sunt in eo, quæ in Cedreno, Theophane †, Glyca, aliisque iisdem pene verbis ac sententiis, paucissimis tamen exceptis, descripta: ex hoc autem illi veluti e fonte sua, cum posteriores sint, hausisse, nemo ambiget. Historiam ad aliorum scriptorum loca obscura et ardua explananda apprime necessariam nos e Græca lingua multis ab hinc annis vertimus in Latinam. Quæ utinam aliquando bono reipublicæ literariæ lucem videat." Leonis Allatii Diatriba de Georgiis, apud Fabric. Bib. Græc. vol. x. p. 641.

^d The passage I refer to is as follows: *εὐροῖς . . . οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἔκφυλον, καὶ θεοστνγῆ τε καὶ παμβέβηλον τῶν Μανιχαίων λύσσαν, ἀφ' ἧς ὡσπερ ἔκ τινος λυσσῶντος κυνὸς τὴν αἰσχίστην τε, καὶ κακίστην μετεληφνῦια νόσον ἀνεφύη ἢ τῶν ἀλιτηρίων, καὶ κακοσχόλων εἰκονομάχων ἐμβρόντητος αἵρεσις, καὶ ὄθεν ἀπήρξατο, καὶ ποῦ κατέληξεν, ἢ τις γε τοὺς προστάτας αὐτῆς καὶ συνίστορας ἀλλοτρίους ἐκ περιουσίας τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως καταστήσασα σὺν τοῖς ὁμόφροσιν αὐτῶν ἐκδήλως ἅμα καὶ τὰ τούτων ληρήματα καὶ βληχήματα τῆς ἀδεκάστου δίκης ὑπευθύνους καὶ ἐκδίκους ἀπέδειξεν.* Fabricius Bibl. Græca. vol. x. p. 645.

‡ Theophanes could not have borrowed from Georgius Hamartolus, as he died more than twenty years before the latter wrote his Chronicle. When Allatius wrote these remarks Theophanes had not been printed. But the error has been repeated by Cave (Hist. Liter.) and Fabricius (Bibl. Græc. vol. vi. p. 154.), for whom the same excuse cannot be made.

I place next the *anonymous* author^e of the Chronicle written at the command of Constantine Porphyrogennetus, who stands the first among the “*Scriptores post Theophanem.*” This continuator of Theophanes takes up the history, where his predecessor had ended, namely, at the first year of Leo the Armenian, A. D. 813, and carries it on to the death of Michael III, A. D. 867. In the sixteenth chapter of his fourth book he tells us, that the empress Theodora “delighted with her success in “the conversion of the Bulgarians, and desirous of “achieving a still greater victory, endeavoured to “convert, or exterminate, the Paulicians in the “East^f; an attempt which filled the empire with “many calamities. For her commissioners crucified some, delivered others to the sword, and “drowned others in the sea. About a hundred “thousand in number were thus destroyed, and “their effects brought into the imperial treasury^g.” He then relates how this persecution led to the de-

^e This is the writer whom Milner (vol. iii. p. 208.) dignifies with the name of “Porphyrog.,” and calls “the biographer of “the emperor Michael.” He has evidently borrowed the reference, and transferred it in this strange form to his own work. For even if there were reason to suspect him of any acquaintance with the Byzantine historians, it would not be easy to believe that he could have read this Chronicle as the work of Constantine Porphyrogennetus. It would be curious to discover where he got the reference; as we should then know whether his authority had been misled by the running title “Constantini Porphyrogenneti Continuator,” or whether the blunder was all his own.

^f Τοὺς κατὰ τὴν ἀνατολὴν Παυλικιάνους ἐπειρᾶτο μετὰγειν ὡς βούλοιο πρὸς εὐσέβειαν, ἢ ἐξάγειν καὶ ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων ποιεῖν.

^g Lib. iv. Chronici jussu Constantini Porphyrogenneti conscript. apud *Scriptores post Theophanem*, p. 103.

sertion of Carbeas and the great rebellion of the sect. It is plain from all he says that he entertained the common opinion concerning the Paulicians. For though he speaks in a tone of censure of the conduct of the imperial officers, he does not seem to have disapproved of the persecution, but merely of the imprudent violence with which it was conducted.

Josephus Genesisius^h, who also wrote his History of the period between the deposition of Michael Rhangabe, in 813, and the death of Basil the Macedonian in 889, at the command of Constantine Porphyrogennetus, evidently means to describe the Paulicians, when, in enumerating the successes of Michael the Armenian, he speaks of "those who partook of the abomination of Manesⁱ." Towards the end of his work he describes, at some length, the war with Chrysocheir^k, but he seems to have known little of the Paulicians as a religious sect.

The emperor *Constantine Porphyrogennetus*^l, in

^h Genesisius was not published in the Paris series of the Byzantine writers. A number of learned men laboured successively on the Leipsic manuscript, (see Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* vol. vi. p. 228. et. 620.) but no edition appeared till he was printed in 1733 (with the Latin translation of George Phranza, John Malala, and the *Σύμμικτα* of Leo Allatius) as the twenty-third volume of the Venetian edition of the "*Scriptores Byzantinæ Historiæ*." He met with a most incompetent editor. His four books are a complete ruin; and no one can read them without appreciating the severe remark of him who said, that Genesisius deserves our pity, who after the efforts of so many scholars, fell at last into the impure hands of the Venetians.

ⁱ Ὅσοι τῆς Μάνεντος βδελυρίας μετείχον. *Jos. Genes. de Rebus CP. liber ii. p. 15.*

^k *Jos. Genes. lib. iv. p. 57—60.*

^l *Apud Scriptores post Theophanem.*

His “History of the Life and Exploits of his Grand-
“father Basil,” gives an account of the war with
the Paulicians^m, in which, as he calls them Mani-
chæans, it is evident that he entertained the same
views of their opinions as the earlier writers.

Georgius Monachus, who stands the last in the
collection of the “Scriptores post Theophanem,”
brings down his “Lives of the recent Emperors,”
to his own time, the middle of the tenth century.
Under the reign of “Michael with Theodora,” he
says that the iconoclasts were the protectors of the
“abominable and demoniacal worship of the Mani-
“chæans, from whom in fact they derived their
“originⁿ.”

Georgius Cedrenus^o deduces his Synopsis of His-

^m De Basilii Imperatoris Avi Vita et Rebus gestis. xxxv—
xlili. p. 164. et seq.

ⁿ Scriptores post Theophanem, p. 527. Προστάται τῆς μυσαρᾶς
καὶ δαιμονιώδους τῶν Μανιχαίων θρησκείας, ἀφ’ ὧν καὶ τὴν ἀφορμὴν καὶ
τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰλήφασιν. It does not appear that the orthodox ever
charged the iconoclasts with being connected with the Pauli-
cians, till Michael the Armenian, and his son Theophilus, re-
laxed the rigours of persecution. As these emperors were both
iconoclasts, their moderation was of course turned into a topic
of declamation against their party. But it ought always to be
remembered that the earlier iconoclasts persecuted the Pauli-
cians. And I think we may find the cause of the favour, if
favour it may be called, with which they were regarded by
Michael, not in any respect for their opinions, but in the cir-
cumstance that his elevation to the empire had been predicted
by a fanatic, who, according to the historians, (Zonaras, xv. 22.
p. 135. Cedrenus, p. 497.) was τὸν Ἀθίγγανον, that is to say, a
Paulician.

^o Cedrenus is one of the writers who bear that most indefi-
nite of appellations, George the Monk—but nothing is known of
his personal history. As he has copiously extracted the first

tory (*Σύνοψις Ἱστοριῶν*) from the creation to the year 1057. I have already characterized this writer. The passage I translated, in which he describes the tenets of the Paulicians, is the only one regarding the sect that occurs in his work, which is not to be met with in his predecessors. He notices the transportation of the Paulicians from Armenia to Thrace by Constantine Copronymus^p—the indulgence with which they were treated by Nicephorus Logotheta^q—the persecution under Theodora—and the war with Carbeas^r and Chrysocheir^s, in words for the most part little varied from those of some one or other of the writers who have been already mentioned.

historical work of Joannes Scylitzes*, but takes no notice of what that writer subsequently published in continuation from 1057 to the accession of Alexius Comnenus in 1081, it is probable that he died some time before the end of the eleventh century.

^p Hist. Comp. 463. I find a strong confirmation of the opinion which I have expressed in note ⁿ, on the preceding page, in the difference which is found in the respective accounts given of this fact by Theophanes and Cedrenus. Theophanes, though a sufferer for images, merely states the fact that certain Paulicians were removed into Thrace. (See the original in note ^x, page 40.) Cedrenus relating the same transaction, and evidently with the words of Theophanes before him, cannot omit the opportunity of reproaching the iconoclasts, and says, *προσλαβόμενος τοὺς συγγενεῖς αὐτοῦ Ἀρμενίους καὶ Σύρους αἵρετικούς, εἰς τε τὸ Βυζάντιον μετέκισε, καὶ τὴν Θράκην.*

^q Hist. Comp. 480. ^r Ib. 541, 546. ^s Ib. 571—573.

* Montfaucon describing a MS. of Scylitzes, says, “Est porro ipsissima Historia Cedreni parvo discrimine. In manuscripto tamen non pauca notatu digna habentur, quæ in edito prætermittuntur.” Bibliotheca Coisliniana, pars i. p. 206.

The Annals of *Joannes Zonaras*^t extend from the beginning of the world to the death of Alexius Comnenus, A. D. 1118. He notices the indulgence of Nicephorus to the Manichæans or Athingani^u, the unfortunate result of the persecution under Theodora^x, their alliance with the Saracens^y, and the war they carried on under the command of Chrysocheir^z. He also tells us that Theodorus, whom John Tzimisce had made Patriarch of Antioch, requested that prince to remove the Manichæans from the East into the West, as they corrupted many by their abominable heresy. His request was granted, and the emperor removed them to Philippopolis^a. Near the end of his work he notices the exertions which were made by Alexius Comnenus^b to bring them over to the orthodox faith.

Anna Comnena, in the fourteenth book of the *Alexiad*, says, that “the very impious Paulicians, who
“ are a branch of the Manichæan sect, derived their
“ origin from Paul and John, as the name imports ;
“ who, having drunk off the unadulterated poison
“ of the impiety of Manes, imparted it to their

^t Zonaras, Anna Comnena, and Glycas, all end their works with the death of Alexius, A. D. 1118, and there is nothing positive to determine the order in which they wrote. Cave politely gives precedence to the lady—my excuse for not following his example is, 1^o. because by noticing first the testimony of the annalist, I more conveniently introduce the notice of what was done by Tzimisce : and 2^o. because I believe, upon grounds with which I will not encumber these pages—already I fear sufficiently tedious—that Zonaras was actually the earlier writer.

^u *Annales*, lib. xv. tom. ii. p. 123.

^x *Ann.* lib. xvi. tom. ii. p. 156.

^y *Ib.* p. 158.

^z *Ib.* p. 167, 168.

^a *Ann.* lib. xvii. tom. ii. p. 209.

^b *Ann.* lib. xviii. tom. ii. p. 305.

“followers^c.” She adds that she would have refuted their tenets, had she not observed that the heresy of the Manichæans was an object of general ridicule, and that not only Christian writers, but even Porphyry, had shewn their absurdity. She gives an account of their settlement in Thrace—telling us that the celebrated (*θαυμάσιος*) emperor John Tzimisce having conquered and captured them in Asia, placed them in Europe, as the surest defenders of the empire against the Scythian inroads^d. She also gives a long account of the conferences which her father Alexius held with them at Philippopolis with a view to their conversion^e, but adds nothing to the information respecting their principles which we derive from the earlier sources.

I have found but two places in the Annals of *Michael Glycas*, who has been generally supposed to have written in the twelfth century, in which he speaks of the Paulicians. In one of these he calls them “the heirs of Manes^f ;” in the other he mentions the successful disputation which Alexius Comnenus held “with the Manichæans, who are vulgarly “called Paulicians^g,” and who, he adds, had in great numbers been brought from the East, and settled at Philippopolis^h by the emperor John Tzimisce.

^c Οἱ δυσθεώτατοι Παυλικιάνοι, τῆς Μανιχαϊκῆς ἀποσπάδαι τυγχάνοντες, ἐκ Παύλου καὶ Ἰωάννου ὡς καὶ τοῦνομα λέγειν γεγενημένοι, οἱ τῆς ἀσεβείας τοῦ Μάνεντος ἐπισπασάμενοι ἄκρατον, τοῖς ἀπ’ ἐκείνων μεταδεδόκασιν. *Alexiados lib. xiv. p. 451.*

^d *Alexiad. p. 451.*

^e *Ibid. p. 452—457.*

^f Οἱ τοῦ Μάνεντος κληρονόμοι Παυλικιάνοι. *Annal. pars iii. p. 208.*

^g The cause of the emperor’s stay at Philippopolis was ἡ μετὰ τῶν Μανιχαίων διάλεξις, οὗς Παυλικιάνους ἢ δημῶδης ὀνομάζει φωνή. *Annal. pars iv. p. 335.*

^h A passage of Geoffroy de Ville-hardouin is peculiarly valu-

Such is the evidence of the contemporary writers on the religious character of the Paulicians. All who mention them, with one voice describe them as Manichæans. The moderns who have been best able to estimate the testimony of the Greeks, have uniformly received it as decisive, and regarded the Paulicians as a Manichæan sect. And what is there improbable in this opinion? The prevalence of the Gnostic tenets in the second and third centuries is well known. Tenets greatly more extravagant than those ascribed to the Paulicians, were propagated extensively, almost in the days of the apostles. The energies of the most illustrious of the Christian writers of that early period were employed in combating the errors of the Valentinians, the Marcionites, and their kindred sects. The dualistic principle had from a very remote antiquity taken a firm hold upon the Oriental mind; and the attempts to unite it with Christianity afford a highly

able, not only as marking the residence of the Paulicians at Philippopolis, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, but as establishing the connexion, as far as the name is concerned, between the Manichæans of the East and West, in the middle ages. "Une partie des genz qui estoient Popolicani, s'en allèrent à Johannisse, et se rendirent à lui, et li distrent: Sire, che-
"nauche devant Phinepople, enuoie t'ost, nos te rendrons la ville
"tote." No. 208. p. 165. In a long note on this place Du Cange indisputably proves that the words Popolicani, Publicani, Popelicans, mean the same as Πανλικιάναι; and says, "Ils sont
"appelez Publicani par Wilhelmus Neubrig. lib. ii. cap. xiii.
"Radulphus Monachus Cogeshalensis, Robert. Monach. lib. iii.
"et iv. Histor. Hierosolym. Baldricus Dolens. lib. ii. Tude-
"bodus lib. iii. et autres." p. 342. See also the word Populicani in his Latin Glossary. Which Mr. Maitland has given.
"Facts and Documents," p. 91.

interesting, but by no means a surprising feature, in the history of the Gospel.

The writers who have questioned the common opinion respecting the Paulicians, insinuate that their orthodox opponents were unable to comprehend the evangelical principles which they really entertained, and therefore imputed their rejecting the superstitious practices which had begun to prevail in the church, to their being infected with the opinions of the ancient heretics. But they might have remembered that the iconoclasts were at the very same time violently opposing those superstitions, without incurring the same imputation. All kinds of charges were made against that party by the worshippers of images. They were branded as Jews, and Mohammedans, and Arians, and even Manichæans—but we always readily perceive that their opponents employed these appellations merely as terms of abuse. We can always see that they were merely designed as rhetorical flourishes, for they are never reduced to a distinct and specific form. The most bigoted image worshipper, for instance, never thought of refuting the errors of the iconoclast, by gravely entering upon a refutation of the doctrine of the two principles, and upon the proof of the Divine origin of the Old Testament. And yet this is precisely what is done by the writers against the Paulicians. They all evidently thought that by refuting the Manichæan notions, they were refuting the sect against which they were contending. They make extensive collections from Scripture, and produce the arguments of the ancient ecclesiastical writers, against those notions, and those only. If those were not the opinions of the

Paulicians, they do not notice their opinions at all. And if we are not prepared to suspect some of the most intelligent writers of the Eastern church of downright fatuity, and to deny their claim to be regarded as honest witnesses of matters of fact; if we are not determined to set up our own conjectures against contemporary testimony, and to make antiquity bow to our prejudices, we must admit the correctness of the common opinion, and regard the Paulicians as a Manichæan sect.

But the evidence speaks plainly enough for itself. It needs not to be enforced by a laboured advocacy. And I have now but to assure you that

I am, my dear Sir,
with great respect and esteem,
yours very truly,

J. G. DOWLING.

SOUTHGATE STREET, GLOUCESTER,
June 18, 1835.





