

1349 AD – THE BLACK DEATH

“They say ‘If a man divorces his wife, and she goes from him, and becomes another man's, shall he return unto her again? Will not that land be greatly polluted?’ But you have played the harlot with many lovers; yet return again to me, says the LORD.”
(Jeremiah 3:1)

HISTORY

The chronological timing of this verse, 1349 AD, was the peak period of Black Death in Europe. The plague entered the ports of France, Spain, Portugal, and England in 1348. By 1349 it was ravaging cities all across Western Europe. Why did God allow the plague to happen? Was the Church guilty of a great sin? This is what the prophecy of Jeremiah 3 v 1 addresses.

Since the earliest days the Catholic Church has been firm on the policy that separation may occur but divorce is impossible until death of either spouse (see Appendix A for the history). This long standing policy was entrenched as inviolable Catechism at the Council of Trent:¹

*The Council of Trent was the first to make a dogmatic decision on this question. This took place in Session XXIV, canon v: "**If anyone shall say that the bond of matrimony can be dissolved for the cause of heresy, or of injury due to cohabitation, or of wilful desertion; let him be anathema**", and in canon vii: "**If anyone shall say that the Church has erred in having taught, and in teaching that, according to the teaching of the Gospel and the Apostles, the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved, and that neither party — not even the innocent, who has given no cause by adultery — can contract another marriage while the other lives, and that he, or she, commits adultery who puts away an adulterous wife, or husband, and marries another; let him be anathema.**"*

Yet the Catholic Church herself has entered and exited sacred communion with the kings and queens of Europe on an almost non-stop merry-go-round of spiritual divorce (see Appendix B for the list). The justifications the Popes provided for their ex-communications were the same criteria which the Catholic Church specifically prohibited spouses from divorcing, e.g. heresy. Prior to 1349 – the date of this prophecy – the Catholic Church had excommunicated in (11th

¹ <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05054c.htm>

century) one emperor and two kings; (12th century) three emperors and a king. This pattern was getting worse: (13th century) two emperors and five kings.

PROPHECY OF JEREMIAH 3 V 1

“They say ‘If a man divorces his wife, and she goes from him, and becomes another man's, shall he return unto her again? Will not that land be greatly polluted?’”

The LORD is simply pointing out that the Catholic Church policy is dead set against divorce.

“But you have played the harlot with many lovers;”

But the Catholic Church herself entered and exited spiritual relationships with the kings and queens of Europe like a lusty harlot in a brothel going from one partner to the next.

“yet return again to me, says the LORD”

The root of the problem is the people of God rejected Jesus Christ as King and appointed a Pope to be spiritual ruler over them.

Here is the kindness and mercy of God illustrated – that the LORD is willing to take back as his wife a communion of saints which divorced Him and became married to another man, the Pope. How many men in real life would remarry a spouse that dumped them to marry another man? Not many men would do that because they couldn't find it in their heart to forgive the woman for the all the pain the family break-up caused. Neither could they find it in their hearts a renewed love that would sustain their faithfulness in a renewed relationship. Nor could they even sleep at night for worry that a woman who proved she was capable of breaking her vows would not do so a second time.

But the Church was not listening to the wooing of God to return to her. She was incurably unfaithful even in the midst of the most horrible chastisement: the Black Death plague.

In the awful pandemic millions of Catholics died in pain without a priest saying the last sacraments over them. Thus the Black Death was also a powerful illustration that membership in an institutional church can't save you; neither can sacraments save you; neither can prayers of priests save you. Only the blood of Jesus on the Cross can save you – if you believe God raised Christ Jesus from the dead on the third day – and he died on the Cross to pay the punishment for your sins – once and for all.

But the Catholic Church does not preach the gospel of faith in the blood of Jesus Christ alone because it does a great business in selling indulgences and harvesting tithes of supplicants who believe its priests and its sacraments alone can save from eternal destruction.

And so the Harlot Church brings the punishment of harlotry upon her people: painful premature death and suffering.

SPIRITUAL NUMBER ANALYSIS

For a mind that has wisdom please read on. See truth from another perspective.

PART ONE

Jeremiah **3 v 1** is the **19,004th** verse in Scripture.

The number **19,004** = **4** x **4751** [**640th** prime]

The spiritual meaning of **4** is 'Message'

The spiritual meaning of **640** means 'Love Correction'. The spiritual meaning of **4751** is 'Humbly Praise the Father'.

The members of the Catholic Communion did not 'Love Correction' – in other words, they were unteachable. By submitting themselves to a man, the Pope, they refused to accept God as their Father. The believers who refused to bow to the authority of the Pope because they accepted only God in Heaven as their spiritual Father – those ones 'Humbly Praise the Father'.

PART TWO

Jeremiah **3 v 1** is the **1,349nd** verse of the Prophets starting at Isaiah **1 v 1**.

The number **1,349** = **19** x **71**

The spiritual meaning of **19** is 'Faith'

The spiritual meaning of **71** is 'Judge'.

The Catholic Church was condemned according to their own standard: 'if anyone... let them be anathema'. The Catholic Church was making ties and severing ties of communion to kings,

and emperors, and lots of other people according to justifications the Church prohibited as a cause of divorce. Therefore, the Catholic Church was 'Judged' by its own 'Faith'.

PART THREE

The spiritual number **1349** means 'Religion of Man Breaks Faith with God'.

APPENDIX A – HISTORY OF CATHOLIC TEACHING ON MARRIAGE

Source: Catholic Catechism²

Tradition and the Historical Development in Doctrine and Practice — The doctrine of Scripture about the illicitness of divorce is fully confirmed by the constant tradition of the Church. The testimonies of the Fathers and the councils leave us no room for doubt. In numerous places they lay down the teaching that not even in the case of adultery can the marriage bond be dissolved or the innocent party proceed to a new marriage. They insist rather that the innocent party must remain unmarried after the dismissal of the guilty one, and can only enter upon new marriage in case death intervenes.

We read in Hermas (about the year 150), "Pastor", mand. IV, I, 6: "Let him put her (the adulterous wife) away and let the husband abide alone; but if after putting away his wife he shall marry another, he likewise committeth adultery (ed. Funk, 1901). The expression in verse 8, "For the sake of her repentance, therefore, the husband ought not to marry", does not weaken the absolute command, but it gives the supposed reason of this great command. St. Justine Martyr (d. 176) says (Apolog., I, xv, P.G., VI, 349), plainly and without exception: "He that marrieth her that has been put away by another man committeth adultery." In like manner Athenagoras (about 177) in his Plea for the Christians 33: "For whosoever shall put away his wife and shall marry another, committed adultery"; Tertullian (d. 247), "De monogamiâ", c, ix (P.L., II, 991): "They enter into adulterous unions even when they do not put away their wives, we are not allowed to even marry although we put our wives away"; Clement of Alexandria (d. 217) (Stromata II.23) mentions the ordinance of Holy Scripture in the following words; "You shall not put away your wife except for fornication, and [Holy Scripture] considers as adultery a remarriage while the other of the separated persons survives." Similar expressions are found in the course of the following centuries both in the Latin and in the Greek Fathers, e.g. St. Basil of Cæsarea, "Epist. can.", ii, "Ad Amphiloichium", can. xlviii (P.G., XXXII, 732); St. John Chrysostom, "De libello repud." (P.G., LI, 218); Theodoretus, on I Cor., vii, 39, 40 (P.G., LXXXII, 275); St. Ambrose, "in Luc.", VIII, v, 18 sqq. (P.L., XV, 1855); St. Jerome, Epist. lx (ad Amand.), n. 3 (P.L., XXII, 562); St. Augustine, "De adulterinis conjugis", II, iv (P.L., XL, 473), etc., etc. The occurrences of passages in some Fathers, even among those just quoted, which treat the husband more mildly in case of

² <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05054c.htm>

adultery, or seem to allow him a new marriage after the infidelity of his spouse, does not prove that these expressions are to be understood of the permissibility of a new marriage, but of the lesser canonical penance and of exemption from punishment by civil law. Or if they refer to a command on the part of the Church, the new marriage is supposed to take place after the death of the wife who was dismissed. This permission was mentioned, not without reason, as a concession for the innocent party, because at some periods the Church's laws in regard to the guilty party forbade forever any further marriage (cf. can. vii of the Council of Compiègne, 757). It is well known that the civil law, even of the Christian emperors, permitted in several cases a new marriage after the separation of the wife. Hence, without contradicting himself, St. Basil could say of the husband, "He is not condemned", and "He is considered excusable" (ep. clxxxviii, can. ix, and Ep. cxcix, can. xxi, in P.G., XXXII, 678, 721), because he is speaking distinctly of the milder treatment of the husband than of the wife with regard to the canonical penance imposed for adultery. St. Epiphanius, who is especially reproached with teaching that the husband who had put away his wife because of adultery or another crime was allowed by Divine law to marry another (Hæres, lix, 4, in P.G., XLI, 1024), is speaking in reality of a second marriage after the death of the divorced wife, and whilst he declares in general that such a second marriage is allowed, but is less honourable, still he makes the exception in regard to this last part in favour of one who had long been separate from his first wife. The other Fathers of the following centuries, in whose works ambiguous or obscure expressions may be found, are to be explained in like manner.

The practice of the faithful was not indeed always in perfect accord with the doctrine of the Church. On account of defective morality, there are to be found regulations of particular synods which permitted unjustifiable concessions. However, the synods of all centuries, and more clearly still the decrees of the popes, have constantly declared that divorce which annulled the marriage and permitted remarriage was never allowed. The Synod of Elvira (A.D. 300) maintains without the least ambiguity the permanence of the marriage bond, even in the case of adultery. Canon ix decreed: "A faithful woman who has left an adulterous husband and is marrying another who is faithful, let her be prohibited from marrying; if she has married, let her not receive communion until the man she has left shall have departed this life, unless illness should make this an imperative necessity" (Labbe, "Concilia", II, 7). The Synod of Arles (314) speaks indeed of counseling as far as possible, that the young men who had dismissed their wives for adultery should take no second wife" (ut, in quantum possil, consilium eis

detur); but it declares at the same time the illicit character of such a second marriage, because it says of these husbands, "They are forbidden to marry" (*prohibentur nubere*, Labbe, II, 472). The same declaration is to be found in the Second Council of Mileve (416), canon xvii (Labbe, IV, 331); the Council of Hereford (673), canon x (Labbe, VII, 554); the Council of Friuli (Forum Julii), in northern Italy (791), canon x (Labbe, IX, 46); all of these teach distinctly that the marriage bond remains even in case of dismissal for adultery, and that new marriage is therefore forbidden.

The following decisions of the popes on this subject deserve special mention: Innocent I, "Epist. ad Exsuper.", c. vi, n. 12 (P.L., XX, 500): "Your diligence has asked concerning those, also, who, by means of a deed of separation, have contracted another marriage. It is manifest that they are adulterers on both sides." Compare also with "Epist. ad Vict. Rothom.", xiii, 15, (P.L., XX, 479): "In respect to all cases the rule is kept that whoever marries another man, while her husband is still alive, must be held to be an adulteress, and must be granted no leave to do penance unless one of the men shall have died." The impossibility of absolute divorce during the entire life of married people could not be expressed more forcibly than by declaring that the permission to perform public penance must be refused to women who remarried, as to a public sinner, because this penance presupposed the cessation of sin, and to remain in a second marriage was to continue in sin.

Besides the adultery of one of the married parties, the laws of the empire recognized other reasons for which marriage might be dissolved, and remarriage permitted, for instance, protracted absence as a prisoner of war, or the choice of religious life by one of the spouses. In these cases, also, the popes pronounced decidedly for the indissolubility of marriage, e.g. Innocent I, "Epist. ad Probum", in P.L. XX, 602; Leo I, "Epist. ad Nicetam Aquil.", in P.L., LIV, 1136; Gregory I, "Epist. ad Urbicum Abb.", in P.L., LXXVII, 833, and "Epist. ad Hadrian. notar.", in P.L., LXXVII, 1169. This last passage, which is found in the "Decretum" of Gratian (C. xxvii, Q, ii, c. xxii), is as follows: "Although the civil law provides that, for the sake of conversion (i.e., for the purpose of choosing the religious life), a marriage may be dissolved, though either of parties be unwilling, yet the Divine law does not permit it to be done." That the indissolubility of marriage admits of no exception is indicated by Pope Zacharias in his letter of 5 January, 747, to Pepin and the Frankish bishops, for in chapter vii he ordains "by Apostolic authority", in answer to the questions that had been proposed to him: "If any layman shall put away his own wife and marry another, or if he shall marry a woman who has been put away by another

man, let him be deprived of communion" [Monum. Germ. Hist.: Epist., III:Epist. Merovingici et Karolini ævi, I (Berlin, 1892), 482]

(c) Laxer Admissions and their Correction — Whilst the popes constantly rejected absolute divorce in all cases, we find some of the Frankish synods of the eighth century which allowed it in certain acute cases. In this regard the Council of Verberie (752) and Compiègne (757) erred especially. Canon ix of the first council is undoubtedly erroneous (Labbe, VIII, 407). In this canon it is laid down that if a man must go abroad, and his wife, out of attachment to home and relatives, will not go with him, she must remain unmarried so long as the husband is alive whom she refused to follow; on the other hand, in contrast to the blameworthy woman, a second marriage is allowed to the husband: "If he has no hope of returning to his own country, if he cannot abstain, he can receive another wife with a penance." So deeply was the pre-Christian custom of the people engraven in their hearts that it was believed allowance should be made for it to some degree. Canon v seems also to grant the unauthorized permission for a second marriage. It treats of the case in which the wife, with the help of other men, seeks to murder her husband, and he escapes from the plot by killing her accomplices in self-defence. Such a husband is allowed to take another wife: "That husband can put away that wife, and, if he will, let him take another. But let that woman who made the plot undergo a penance and remain without hope of marriage." Some explain this canon to mean that the husband might marry again after the death of his first wife, but that the criminal wife was forbidden forever to marry. This last is in agreement with the penitential discipline of the age, because the crime in question was punished by life-long canonical penance, and hence by permanent exclusion from married life.

In its thirteenth canon (according to Labbe, VIII, 452; others call it the sixteenth), the Council of Compiègne gives a somewhat ambiguous decision and may seem to allow absolute divorce. It says that a man who has dismissed his wife in order that she might choose the religious life, or take the veil, can marry a second wife when the first has carried out the resolution. Nevertheless, the intended choice of the state of Christian perfection seems to imply that this canon must be limited to a marriage that has not been consummated. Hence it gives the correct Catholic doctrine, of which we shall speak below. This must also be the meaning of canon xvi (Labbe, VIII, 453; others, canon xix), which allows the dissolution of a marriage between a leper and a healthy woman, so that the woman is authorized to enter upon a new marriage, unless we suppose that here there is a question of the diriment impediment of

impotence. If these canons were really intended in any other sense, then they are contrary to the general doctrine of the Church. Other canons, in which separation and second marriage are allowed, refer undoubtedly to the diriment impediments of affinity and spiritual relationship, or to a marriage contracted in error by persons one of whom is free and the other not free. Hence they have no reference to actual divorce, and cannot be interpreted as a lax concession to popular morals or to passion. It is true that several of the Penitential Books composed about this time in the Frankish regions contain the cases mentioned by these two synods and add others in which the real dissolution of the marriage bond and a new marriage with another wife might be allowed. The following cases are mentioned in several of these Penitential Books: adultery, slavery as punishment for crime, imprisonment in war, wilful desertion without hope of reunion, etc. (Schmitz, "Bussbücher", II, 129 sqq.). These Penitential Books had indeed no official character, but they influenced for a time the ecclesiastical practice in these countries. However, their influence did not last long. In the first decades of the ninth century, the church began to proceed energetically against them (cf. the Synod of Châlons, in the year 813, canon xxxviii; Labbe, IX, 367). They were not completely suppressed at once, especially as a general decay of Christian morality took place in the tenth and early part of the eleventh century. Towards the end of the eleventh century, however, every concession to the laxer practice as regards divorce had been corrected. The complete indissolubility of Christian marriage had become so firmly fixed in the juridical conscience that the authentic collections of church laws the Decretals of the twelfth century, do not even see the necessity of expressly declaring it, but simply suppose it, in other juridical decisions, as a matter of course and beyond discussion. This is shown in the entire series of cases in IV Decretal., xix. In all cases, whether the cause be criminal plotting, adultery, loss of faith, or anything else, the bond of marriage is regarded as absolutely indissoluble and entrance upon a second marriage as impossible.

(d) Dogmatic Decision on the Indissolubility of Marriage — The Council of Trent was the first to make a dogmatic decision on this question. This took place in Session XXIV, canon v: "If anyone shall say that the bond of matrimony can be dissolved for the cause of heresy, or of injury due to cohabitation, or of wilful desertion; let him be anathema", and in canon vii: "If anyone shall say that the Church has erred in having taught, and in teaching that, according to the teaching of the Gospel and the Apostles, the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved, and that neither party — not even the innocent, who has given no cause by adultery — can

contract another marriage while the other lives, and that he, or she, commits adultery who puts away an adulterous wife, or husband, and marries another; let him be anathema." The decree defines directly the infallibility of the church doctrine in regard to indissolubility of marriage, even in the case of adultery, but indirectly the decree defines the indissolubility of marriage. Doubts have been expressed here and there about the dogmatic character of this definition (cf. Sasse, "De Sacramentis", II, 426). But Leo XIII, in his Encyclical "Arcanum", 10 February, 1880; calls the doctrine on divorce condemned by the Council of Trent "the baneful heresy" (hoeresim deterrimam). The acceptance of this indissolubility of marriage as an article of faith defined by the Council of Trent is demanded in the creed by which Orientals must make their profession of faith when reunited to the Roman Church. The formula prescribed by Urban VIII contains the following section: "Also, that the bond of the Sacrament of Matrimony is indissoluble; and that, although a separation *tori et cohabitationis* can be made between the parties, for adultery, heresy, or other causes, yet it is not lawful for them to contract another marriage." Exactly the same declaration in regard to marriage was made in the short profession of faith aproved by the Holy Office in the year 1890 (Collectanea S. Congr. de Prop. Fide, Rome, 1893, pp. 639, 640). The milder indirect form in which the Council of Trent pronounced its anathema was chosen expressly out of regard for the Greeks of that period, who would have been very much offended, according to the testimony of the Venetian ambassadors, if the anathema had been directed against them, whereas they would find it easier to accept the decree that the Roman Church was not guilty of error in her stricter interpretation of the law (Pallavicini, "Hist. Conc. Trid.", XXII, iv).

APPENDIX B – EX-COMMUNICATIONS BY THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

11th Century

Michael Cerularius, Ecumenical **Patriarch** of Constantinople

Henry IV, Holy Roman **Emperor** by Pope Gregory VII over the Investiture Controversy.

Harold II, **King** of England, for perhaps politically motivated reasons by Pope Alexander II in order to justify the invasion and takeover of the kingdom by William the Conqueror in 1066.

Bolesław II the Generous, **Duke** of Poland, was excommunicated in 1080 after murdering the bishop Saint Stanislaus of Kraków.

Philip I of France, **King** of France, for repudiating his marriage and remarrying, by Hugh, Archbishop of Lyon and later reaffirmed by Pope Urban II.

12th Century

Henry V, Holy Roman **Emperor** by Jordan, Archbishop of Milan in 1116 and ratified by Pope Paschal II over the Investiture Controversy. Received back into communion in 1122.

Frederick I Barbarossa, Holy Roman **Emperor**, by Alexander III

Anselm V (Archbishop of Milan) by Pope Honorius II[16]

William I of Sicily, by Pope Adrian IV, while the **king** was waging war against the papal states and raiding pilgrims on their way to the tombs of the apostles.

Ralph I, **Count** of Vermandois was said to have been excommunicated in 1142 by Bishop Saint Ivo of Chartres for repudiating his lawful wife and marrying another[17]

Roger II of Sicily, was excommunicated under the decrees of the Second Lateran Council in 1139

Anacletus II, **antipope**

Holy Roman **Emperor**, Henry IV, excommunicated a second time by Pope Paschal II for refusing to abjure his claim to imperial investitures, posthumously lifted in 1111

In 1170 **Archbishop** of Canterbury Thomas Becket excommunicated Roger de Pont L'Évêque, the archbishop of York, along with Gilbert Foliot, the bishop of London, and Josceline de Bohon, the bishop of Salisbury, for crowning the heir-apparent Henry at York, thereby usurping Canterbury's privileges. In response to these excommunications, the heirs father, Henry II of England famously exclaimed words that led to Becket's assassination.

13th Century

King John of England, excommunicated in 1208 by Pope Innocent III after refusing to accept Cardinal Stephen Langdon as the pope's choice for Archbishop of Canterbury. John relented in 1213 and was restored to communion.

King Afonso II of Portugal, excommunicated in 1212 by Pope Honorius III for weakening the clergy and investing part of the large sums destined to the Catholic Church in the unification of the country. Afonso II promised to reconcile with the Church, however, he died in 1223 without making any serious attempt to do so.

King Andrew II of Hungary, was excommunicated in 1231 after not following the points of Golden Bull of 1222, a seminal bill of rights, which contained new dispositions related to the tithe and hostile practices against the Jews and Muslims of the realm.

Frederick II, Holy Roman **Emperor**, was excommunicated three times. The first time by Pope Gregory IX in 1227 for delaying his promise to begin the 5th Crusade; the excommunication was lifted in 1229. The same pope excommunicated him again in 1239 for making war against the Papal States, a censure rescinded by the new pope, Celestine IV, who died soon after. Frederick was again excommunicated by Pope Innocent IV at the First Council of Lyons in 1245. Frederick repented just before his death and was absolved of the censure in 1250.

Gilbert de Clare, 7th **Earl** of Gloucester was excommunicated in 1264 by Pope Clement IV for rebelling against King Henry III of England during the Second Barons' War.[18] This was lifted in 1268.

King Ladislaus IV of Hungary in 1279, by the pope's envoy Philip, for acting against the Catholic Church and living in a pagan way with the Cumans.

James II of Aragon, in 1286 by Pope Boniface VIII for being crowned **King** of Sicily and thereby usurping a papal fief. His younger brother Frederick III of Sicily was excommunicated for the same reason in 1296.

Jacopo Colonna and Pietro Colonna, both **cardinals**, were excommunicated by Pope Boniface VIII in the bull 'excelso throno' (1297) for refusing to surrender their relative Stefano Colonna (who had seized and robbed the pope's nephew) and refusing to give the pope Palestrina along with two fortresses, which threatened the pope. This excommunication was extended in the same year to Jacopo's nephews and their heirs, after the two Colonna cardinals denounced the pope's election as invalid and appealed to a general council.[19]

Eric VI of Denmark in 1298, by Pope Boniface VIII, for imprisoning Archbishop of Lund, Jens Grand.[19]

Byzantine **Emperor** Michael VIII Palaiologos of Constantinople, by Pope Martin IV.

Peter III of Aragon, by Pope Martin IV