



Sold by  
C. J. STEWART,  
11 KING WILLIAM ST.,  
W. Strand, London.



5.16.17.

Library of the Theological Seminary,  
PRINCETON, N. J.

Division *Puritan*

Section *Coll.*

*SOC*  
*9148*



Howell

Alexander Nowell 1507-8 died 1601-2.. an eminent  
English Divins + the last surviving father of the English  
Reformation.

H. Maskell.

Bp. Grindal (says Strype) corrected and  
overlooked this - life - 164 -

LIBRARY OF THE  
MAY 16 1871  
NEW-YORK HISTORICAL SOCIETY

**THE**  
**REPROVVE OF**  
*M. Dorman his proufe of certaine*  
*Articles in Religion &c. con-*  
*tinued by Alexander*  
*Nowell.*

With a defense of the chiefe authoritie  
and government of Christian Princes  
as well in causes Ecclesiasticall, as ci-  
uill, within their owne dominions, by  
M. Dorman maliciously oppugned.

*Imprinted at London in Fleetstreate,*  
*at the signe of the Oliphante,*  
*by Henry Wykes.*

Anno. 1566.



An admonition to the Reader.



After Dozman beinge desirous to poure out his passion against the godly government of Christian Princes vsinge their lawfull authoritie in a bandoninge of Poperie & Superstition, & in the restorvng of true pietie and Religion, and hauinge a great facultie and oportunitie offered readie to his hande to accomplish his intended malice (as shal hereafter plainly appeare) would needes by hooke or crooke, bringe in this longe impertinent treatie against godly Christian Princes, emongst the partes of his processe of the Popes supzernacie: and the same hath he also prosequuted moze largely a great deale, than the said principall matier of the Popes supzernacie it selfe makinge this, moze than double in quantitie to that.

The cause which he colouredlie counterfeiceth, why he would thus do, is by him selfe in the conclusion of his last processe, and next befoze the beginning of this, expessed by these very wordes. *It foloweth now that I show to you who is and of right ought to be that Head: if first I doo you to vnderstand, that it must necessarily be a Priest, and that so by iust consequence neither lay man, woman, nor childe can be capable of that office.* These be his wordes. But seinge the office, whiche he speaketh of, can be none other, than the office of beinge the onely head of Christes vniuersall Church here in earth: whereof he hath in that whole processe intreated, all the world may see, that he had no cause, by any consequence to proue that neither lay man, woman, nor childe can be capable of that office: soz thus he speaketh, as though we

ms  
3/17

AN ADMONITION TO

Had maintained that a Christian Prince might be head of Christs whole Church here in earth. But we do most certainly & plainly affirme that neither Prince, nor Priest, nor any person earthly can be capable of any such office. Wherefoze B. Dozimans head was scarcely capable of good reason, and remembraunce, when he would proue that no lay man, woman, nor childe, can be capable thereof, as against vs, who do our selves affirme the same. And all men may see, that if that were his consideration, he might well haue spared his labour bestowed in this processe. But he meaneth, he will say, to proue that no Christian Prince, man, woman, nor childe, can be capable of the office of being chiefe gouernour, as well in causes Ecclesiasticall, as ciuill, within their owne dominions. I would he had than spoken plainly accordinge to his meaninge: for so should he not haue deceiued the simple, and the impertinence of such a treatie in his processe of the Popes supzremacie might well haue appeared, and withall his meaninge had bene manifest, that he was determined in a processe though impertinent, to cast his venime, and poure out his poison against godly Princes as I haue saide.

Now besides his malice most mouing him thereto, that he would, he thought he had good facultie, and habilitie, that he could largely accomplish the same, by the oportunitie of plentious matier and stuffe, offered vnto him readie framed vnto his handes. Whiche was I assure you, what colour so euer he praxendeth, the very cause in dede, why he would needs prosequute this processe so largely in this impertinent place. The case standeth thus.

Stanislaus Hosius a Bishop of Polonte, & now Cardinal

Small of Rome also, hath written an answer to a little booke of Wrentius intituled Prolegomena: In the seconde booke of the whiche De Iudicibus Ecclesiasticis, he hath at large prosecuted this matter against Princes chiefe government in causes Ecclesiasticall. This treatie of Hosius *M. Doorman* founde so readie framed for him, and had so good a likinge thereof, and so feared praevention by some of his selowes, dayly snatchinge vp other mens woorkes, & thrusting of them abroade into the worlde for their owne, that he thought good to translate it, though impertinent to his purpose, into this his booke out of Hosius, as shall hereafter to the good Reader most plainely appeare. In dede he hath furnished the margent of his booke with the names of the ancient Doctours, *Ignatius the holy martyr, Policarpus disciple to Iohn the Euangelist, blessed Cyprian, Athanasius that stronge pillar of the Church, S. Hierome, S. Ambrose, S. Augustine,* & so forth. But he was made Bachelor of Diuinitie I beleaue, befoze he opened any of their bookes: had he furnished his margent with these notes, *Hosius Polonus, Hosius Harmiensis, Hosius Episcopus, Hosius Cardinalis,* he had dealt simple: for I assure you, he oweth to him alone all his Doctours, all his authorities, all his Diuinitie in this treatie: the Studie of whome alone, it may seme, hath made him Bachelor of the same. And to the ende, the good Reader may see, that *M. Doorman* need not to take the mater so hoate, that I called him a In the preface of his disproues! traslatour, and bozower, and said that I did answer Hosius rather than him, I haue here in a brieue table set forth *M. Doorman* his whole Methode of this treatie, wherby the good Reader may easely iudge of this mater: bet wene vs.

AN ADMONITION TO  
M. Dormans Methode vsed in  
this his seconde parte.

**F**irst you must vnderstande that tow or thre of his first leaues of this treatie, whiche are the 15. 16. & 17. are spent for the most parte in a p̄æface, as plenti- full of railinges, reuilinges, and reproches, as bare of god reasons, authozities, and p̄oufes: yet could he not goe through with these matiers though peculiarie ap- pertaininge to his owne proper facultie, without some boꝝowinge. For shortly after the beginnunge, he hath boꝝowed of Hosius five doctours on a heape at once.

S. Ambrose,	}	}	S. Hierome,	Dorman.	Hosius lib. 4.
S. Basill, and Theophilactus.			S. Augustine, and Chrysostome.	fol. 16. b.	fol. 216. b. 217. a.

These doth he alleage in the same ordꝛe, and with the same woꝝdes, and deuideth them into tow leashes as it were, by iij. and iij. iust as doeth Hosius. And as he be- ginneeth, so continneeth he like a constant man: and by and by boꝝoweth moe textes of Scriptures of Hosius, than here be doctours.

<i>¶ Places of the Scripture.</i>	<i>Alleaged by M. Dorman.</i>	<i>Borowed of Hosius.</i>
¶ Leuitici. 10. Deuteron. 17. Deuteron. 21. Ezechiel. 44. Aggzi. 2. Malach. 2. 1. Corinth. 12. Act. 20. Eight textes of Scripture in order one after an other.	Dor. fol. 18. & 19. per totum.	Hos. lib. 2. fol. 98 b. 98. a.
¶ Ignatius ad Smyrnenfes. ¶ 1. Corinth. 12. & Act. 20. again.	Dorm. 20. b. Dorm. 20. b.	Hos. li. 1. fo. 39. b Hos. li. 2. fo. 98. b
¶ Heb. 13. Obedite ijs &c. Allea- ged without coatatiõ for that he founde it so in Hosius, and jist not seeke further.	Dorm. 20. b.	Hos. lib. 1. fol. 37. b.

¶ Con

Histories, and Doctours.	Alleged by M. Dorman.	Borrowed of Ho- sius.
¶ Constantinus the Empe- rour alleged out of Ru- finus historie Ecclesiasti- call. lib. 1. cap. 2.	Dorm. 21. b. D. Hard. Cōfut. A- pol. fol. 309. hath the same.	Hosius. lib. 2. fol. 113. a, b.
¶ S. Augustine, epistola. 266.	Dorm. 22. a.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 113. a. versus finem.
¶ Valentinian the elder Emperour.	Dorm. 22. a.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 119. b
¶ The expurgatiō of Pope Sixtus.	Dorm. 22. b.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 119. b
¶ Valentinian the yōger Emperour.	Dorm. 22. b. 23. a.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 119. b.
¶ S. Ambrose lib. 5. epistola. 33.	Dorm. 22. b.	Hof. lib. 1. fol. 39. a.
¶ S. Ambrose lib. 5. epistola. 32.	Dorm. 22. b. D. Hard. Cōfut. A- pol. fol. 317. b. hath the same.	Hof. lib. 1. fol. 38. b.

In these tow last he hath used hysteron proteron  
Both with S. Ambrose and his authour Hosius also.

¶ S. Ambrose lib. 5. epi- stola. 34.	Dorm. 23. a.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 119. b
¶ Basilius the Emperour.	Dorm. 23. a. b.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 118. b
¶ Theodorice <sup>o</sup> king of the Gothes alleged out of the. 4. Romaine Synode Sub Symmacho papa.	Dorm. 23. b.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 120. b.
¶ Aurelian <sup>o</sup> the Emperour alleged out of Eusebius.	Dorm. 24. a.	Hof. lib. 1. fol. 121. a.
¶ The examples of Ozias and Oza.	Dorm. 24. a.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 63. b. 64. a. & 75. a.
¶ The example of kinge Saul.	Dorm. 24. a.	Hof. lib. 1. fol. 37. b. 38. a.

These

AN ADMONITION TO

The Doctours, and Histories.	Alleged by M. Dorman.	Borrowed of Ho- sius.
¶ Constantius the Empe- rour.	Dorm. 24. b.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. no. 2.
¶ Pope Liberius out of A- thanas. ad solitariam vitā agentes.	Dorm. 24. b.	Hof. lib. 1. fol. 36. b. & lib. 2. no. 2.
¶ Hosius Cordubēsis out of Athanasius in the same place.	Dorm. 25. 2.	Hof. lib. 1. fol. 35. b. & 37. a. & lib. 2. fol. 43. b.
¶ Athanasius him selfe E- pistola ad solitariam vitā agentes.	Dorm. 25. b.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. no. 2.
¶ Athanasius againe.	Dorm. 26. a.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. no. b.
¶ Iohn Damascene.	Dorm. 27. 2.	Hof. lib. 1. fol. 37.
¶ Deuteron. 17. Ezech. 44. Agg. 2. 1. Corinth. 12. Act. 20. repeted.	Dorm. 29. a. b.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 97. b. 98. a.
¶ Liberius, Hosius Cor- dubensis, and Athanasius, repeded.	Dorm. 29. b. 30. a.	Hof. lib. 1. fol. 36. b. lib. 2. fol. 43. b. & no. a. b.
¶ S. Ambrose repeted.	Dorm. 30. a.	Hof. li. 2. fo. 18. a. 19. b.
¶ Chrysostome in verba Esaie & lib. 3. de sacerdo- tio, alleaged, inuerso or- dine.	Dorm. 30. a.	Hof. lib. 1. fol. 39. b.
¶ Damascene repeted.	Dorm. 30. b.	Hof. lib. 1. fol. 37. a. b.

Dorm. fol. 30. b.  
11. a. & c.

Now M. Dorman here leauinge the Bishop of Sa-  
rum his sermon, fallett in hande with the Confutation  
of a piece of the Apologie, hauinge oportunitie of great  
facilitie therein likewise offered him by Hosius, who  
of his liberalitie hath leante him his answeres therto  
also. And for so much as D. Hardinge hath written a  
Confutation of the Apologie, for these twentie leaues  
now folowinge M. Dorman hath the same treatie, that  
his

his maister in his said Confutation hath. And so I must from hence forth for the most part, make my table tripartite: and in confuting of M. Dozman, I muste answer not onely Hosius, as afoze, but his maister D. Hardinge also: whereby the good Reader may in the meane time take a tast & proufe, what maner of thinge that Confutation of the Apologte is, vntill the full answer there to be put in printe.

Expositiōs of scriptures Doctors, and Histories.	Vsed by M. Dorman.	By D. Har- dinge.	Borrowed of Hosius.
¶ Moses a Prieste, or no Priest, the 98. Psalme, and S. Augustine alleaged.	Dorm. fol. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35.	D. Hard. Confut. Apol. fol. 305. a. b.	
¶ Iosua his example with the like treatie.	Dorm. 35. b. 36. a.	Hard. 305. b.	
¶ Numeri cap. 27. alleaged.	Dorm. 36. a.	Hard. 305. b.	
¶ Kinge Dauid his example answered. Oza. 1. Paral. 23.	Dorm. 35. b. 37. a.	Hard. 305. b. 306. a.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 66. b. 67. a.
¶ Foundations made by Kinges.	Dorm. 37. a.		Hof. lib. 2. fo. 67. a
¶ Solomon, Ezechias, Iosaphat, Iosias, Ios, examples all at once answered.	Dorm. 37. a. b. 38. a.	Hard. 307. a. b.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 66. b.
¶ Dauids example particularie answered.	Dorm. 38. a.	Hard. 305. b. 306. a.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 66. b. 67. a.
¶ Solomons example answered particularie.	Dorm. 38. b.	Hard. 306. a.	Hof. lib. 2. fo. 67. b.
¶ Bisshoppe Cranmer reproched.	Dorm. 38. b.	Hard. 306. a.	
¶ Ezechias example answered.	Dorm. 38. a. 39. b.	Hard. 306. a. b.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 68. a.
¶ Iehu his example answered.	Dorm. 39. a.	Hard. 306. b.	

## AN ADMONITION TO

Expositiōs of Scriptures Doctors, and Histories.	Vsed by M. Dorman,	By D. Har- dinge.	Borrowed of Hofius.
¶ Iosias his example an- sweread.	Dorm. 39. a.	Hard. 307. a.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 68. a.
¶ Iosaphat and Ioas exam- ples answeread.	Dorm. 39. a.	Hard. 306. b. 307. a.	Hof. lib. 2. fo. 67. b. 68.
¶ Alexander Magnus his exāple alleaged out of Q. Curtius, Iosephus, and O- rigines.	Dorm. 39. b.		Hof. lib. 1. fol. 40. a.
¶ Cōstantinus Magnus his example answeread.	Dorm. 41. 42.	Hard. 308. 309.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 75. & 113. a. b.
¶ Theodosius the Empe- rour his example answere- ad.	Dorm. 43.	Hard. 309. b. & 310. a.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 75. a 112. b. 113. a. b.
¶ Concilium Aquileiense alleaged.	Dorm. 43. b.		Hof. lib. 2. fo. 112. b.
¶ S. Ambrose lib. 5. Episto- la. 32. alleaged.	Dorm. 43. b.	Hard. 317. b.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 112. b.
¶ Chalcedon Councell.	Dorm. 44. a. b.	Hard. 315. b. 316. a. b.	Hof. li. 2. fol. 114. b.
¶ The thirde councell Cō- stantinopolitan.	Dorm. 44. b. 45. a. b.	Hard. 316. b.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 115. b 116. a.
¶ Arausican Councell.	Dorm. 45. b. 46. a.	Hard. 316. b.	Hof. lib. 2. fo. 116. a.
¶ Iustinian the Emperour his example answeread.	Dorm. 46. b. 47. 48. 49.	Hard. 317. b. 318.	Hof. lib. 2. fol. 83.

Here is the summe of the matter, and the maner of  
the Methode, which M. Dorman vseth in this treatte a-  
gainst Christian Princes: here is the difference be-  
twene M. Dorman and Hofius: whereby all reasonable  
men may see, that I lied not. when I said, that I should  
in dēde answere the latine Papistes, and namely Ho-  
sius, rather than M. Dorman. For what hath M. Doz-  
man of his owne: Surely nothings, that is any thinge  
to purpose hath he, but of other mens, and that shame-  
fully stoulen, not honestly borrowed. And our other  
English

English Papistes booke, whiche is so thicke abroade, as nue woorkes and inuentions, are all by like art and Methode made, and compiled.

No mervaille therefore that we haue such plentie of them, seeing M. Doorman and his felowes haue now inuented a way, how any that hath a litle learninge in the Latine language, may sodenly, and with great ease and facilitie, become not a Bachelor of Diuinitie only, but a woorthie wryter, and famous authour also: and specially a cunninge compiler of spanne nue wrought woorkes.

Famosi.  
Compilatores  
alienorum scri-  
pturum.

And for my part, I doe thanke M. Doorman, that he hath so handled the matier, that in confutinge of him I might at once answer the reasons of that so highly esteemed Archpapist Hosius: and withall geue the good Reader a tast, what manner of thinge that confutation of D. Hardinges is, vntill the full answer to the same be published, whiche to so longe a booke as it is, requireth some time: and also to notifie to the worlde, that though our aduersaries doe wryte many bookes, there is not yet so great diuersitie of matter, as there is of bookes, which are made many, by often repetion of the same thinges, borrowed of the Latine Papistes: whose bookes haue bene longe abroade in y<sup>e</sup> worlde, in the hādes of them, who doe vnderstande that language, with such euell successe of their Popishe superstition, sith the wrytinge thereof, as to the worlde is wel knownen. The like successe may our English Papistes looke for of their bookes, or rather farre worse: how much more simple, & of baser estimation are their searle translations, then were the other originall woorkes of the learned Latine authours. The fragmentes & patches of whose bookes,

AN ADMONITION TO THE READER.

by M. Dozman here alleaged, I doubt nothinge but  
I haue answered to the satisfiing of al indifferent and  
reasonable Readers.

I haue thought good to note the printes of certaine  
bookes vsually here alleaged, that the Reader, who list  
seeke, may the moze easely finde the places out of them  
alleaged.

Hosius. Confutatio Prolegomenon Brentij. Parisijs apud  
Guilielmum Desboyes, &c. 1560. in octauo.  
Eusebi<sup>o</sup>. &c Hist. Ecclesi. & de vita Costantini. &c. Froben, Basilee. 1554.  
Conciliorum Tomi tres. Coloniz Agripp. ex officina Iohannis  
Quentel, 1551.

The places also, where M. Dozman is in this booke  
answered summarely and briefly, are these.

Fol. 55. b. 56. 57. 58. 59. &c.

Fol. 113. 114. &c. Fol. 135. 136. &c.

Fol. 171. 172. 173. &c. Fol. 192. 193. &c.

Fol. 221. 223. &c. Fol. 237. 238. &c.

Fol. 241. 246. 247. &c. Fol. 250. 251. &c.

Fol. 275. 276. &c.

Hereof also I thought good to admonish the learned &  
occupied readers, that list not bestow their good time, in  
long processe, which yet are necessaric for the readers  
of meaner vnderstanding, specially in the answering  
of such malicious & venemous false sleanders, as M.  
Dozman in this treatie, without all iust cause, hath bea-  
ped vpon Christian Princes, & specially vpon our most  
gracious soueraigne, vpon our lawes, & countrey, most  
insultously and vniuersally: which most odious false  
reproches of an vnnaturall subiect, I could not but (as  
by the ductile of a true subiect I do stand bounden) with  
al earnestnes and vehemencie labour to repell, and from  
them most farre to remoue.

FINIS

¶ The faultes escaped in the Printinge would be mended  
before the readinge of the Booke.

Leaf.	Page.	Line.	Faultes.	Correction.
7.	1.	¶ last	partes the	partes of the
7.	2.	11.	man by Chzistianitie,	man, by Chzistianitie
8.	1.	3.	shall haue	should haue
11.	2.	27.	and felowes	and your felowes
12.	1.	8.	of Church	of the Church
15.	2.	¶ last	errours and Ignorāce,	errours, and Ignorāce
16.	1.	20.	be preachinge	by preachinge
22.	2.	¶ last	ought to euerie	ought euerie
26.	2.	23.	at	that
29.	2.	2.	this	his
37.	1.	13.	that if all	that all
38.	1.	3.	perelous	most perelous
40.	1.	20.	by the same tēporalitie	al those woordes must
			& spiritualitie together	be blotted out
43.	1.	22.	¶ Distes, betwene	¶ Distes, and betwens
46.	1.	1.	D. Hardinge noted	Hosius noted
56.	2.	6.	proued	he proueth
47.	1.	29.	Thus saith S. Paule	Thus saith S. Paules:
60.	1.	17.	was for naught,	was not for naught,
144.	2.	24.	vseth,	vseth,
163.	1.	27.	thee	thie
182.	1.	4.	the marginall note is lackinge.	Hosius lib. 2. fol. 96. a.
194.	1.	16.	189 in the margent.	179.
201.	1.	20.	¶ Dopes	¶ Dope
204.	2.	9.	and	as
224.	2.	17.	most	more
232.	1.	28, 29	Eunonius Eunonian	Eunomius Eunomian
241.	1.	24.	where, now	where? now
243.	1.	26.	to Dioscorus, it is so:	to Dioscorus, It is so,
243.	2.	28.	¶ Dinces	¶ Judges
248.	1.	31.	wholle stode	whole Councell stode
254.	2.	1.	but to the mischiefe,	but it is to ¶ mischiefe:
259.	2.	25.	¶ Caian	¶ Craiane
259.	2.	29.	this Iustinian	thus. Iustinian
274.	2.	3.	the rulers	the rules
275.	1.	17.	cleuches	cleuches
281.	1.	18.	exemptuous	exemptions
282.	2.	32.	Shakerley	Shakloche
287.	1.	4.	to my	to pphemy

¶ Other pointes in Orthographie, and pointinge the good  
Reader may easely perceiue.







Dorman. Folio. 15.

THAT THE HEAD OF CHRIS-  
TES CHVRCHE HERE IN EARTH  
MVST NEEDES BE A PRIEST.

Norwell.



His proposition woulde either haue  
other pꝛoufes, then are to be founde  
in the processe folowinge: or these  
pꝛoufes doe require an other propo-  
sition: For of all the sentences, au-  
thozities, and reasons, contened in  
this treatie folowinge, continuinge

M. Dormans p-  
position, and his  
pꝛoufes, are im-  
pertinent either  
to other,

fyue and thirtie leaues, there is not as muche as one,  
that doth conclude or pꝛoue this his proposition, THAT  
THE HEAD OF CHRISTES CHVRCHE HERE  
IN EARTH MVST NEEDES BE A PRIEST. In  
dæde, here is plentie of pꝛoufes, that Priestes may  
pꝛeache, may deale in matters of Religion, and maie  
resolue men of doubttes therein. But to what purpose  
is that, to pꝛoue suche thinges as no man denieth: or  
to alleage suche thinges, as for pꝛoufes of one heade  
pꝛieste ouer all the Church, whiche are common to all  
pꝛiestes in the Church: and therefore not declaringe  
any one to be Heade, but pꝛouinge them all to be of  
equall authoritie: that is, all to be Ecclesiasticall mi-  
nisters, and therefore no Heades, but rather Seruan-  
tes of the Church: whiche sãinge no man denieth, M.  
Dorman (as I befoze touched) might well haue spared  
this longe processe, without any his lacke or losse at al.  
Further, had it not beene sufficient for M. Dorman, to  
haue attempted to pꝛoue, That Christes Church here in earth

M. Dorman p-  
ueth that,  
whiche no man  
denieth.

A

myst

must of necessitie haue one chiefe head: and, That the Bisshoppe of Rome is the saide one head: vnllesse he had proued also, that the saide Heade muste needes be a Prieste: doubted M. Dozman whether the Pope were a priest or no: as in dede it is greatly to be doubted. Surely if he do not doubt thereof, he may well see, that he might haue spared this parte, whiche he hath made longer & larger then bothe the other. For if he can proue that the Bisshoppe of Rome, is, and ought of right to be the onely heade of Christes Church, sainge he is, by these mens iudgementes, and muste of necessitie (as beinge a Bisshop) be a Priest also: it foloweth by iuste consequence, that the saide heade of the Church, muste needes be a Priest. Which thinge D. Hardinge M. Dozmanns mai-ster, and others well consideringe, haue laboured onely to proue that the Bisshoppe of Rome is, and ought to be the head of Christes wholle Church here in earth: nothinge doubting, but that they should withal proue, as well that the saide head of the Church was, and must of necessitie be a Prieste, and that there muste be one head of the whole Church also: takinge it for an vndoubted matter, that the Bisshoppe of Rome is bothe a prieste, and not two or thre, but one onely persone. Wherefoze surely M. Dozman whether he do vndoubtedly take the Pope to be a Priest (as al other Papistes do) or haue some doubt therein, (as wee haue verie greate and iuste cause to doubt thereof) he hath in this his particiõ either one or two superfluous partes, or elles hath he lefte out one parte, as necessarie as any of the other thre. That is, to haue proued that the Bisshoppe of Rome is a Priest: and so to haue made his treatie quadripartite, as containinge foure partes

M. Dormans  
 diuision either  
 superfluous, or  
 defectiue.

of his Popes supzremacie, For consideringe that the Bishop of Rome hath no signe, proprietie, no; pointe of a Bishop or Priest, in the scriptures appointed: and hath all signes, pointes, and properties of a temporal & worldly prince, vsually accustomed: it may be doubted, lest M. Dozman by prouing him to be head of Christes Church, shoulde seeme therewith to proue, that a temporal man, and not a Bishop or priest, were heade of the Church. For what one pointe of a temporal lord lacketh he: or what one pointe of a Ecclesiasticall person hath he: what spiritualtie hath there bene in most part of Popes these many hundzeth yeeres, but spiritual wickednes: if onely oplinge, & shauinge (for what hath he elles?) doo make him so spiritual, they haue surely very spiritual vnguentaries & barbers at Rome. Seeinge therfore, M. Dozman, in your whole procelle of the Popes supzremacie, there is no one point moze doubtlesol, than whether the Pope be a priest or no, you shoulde either not haue omitted that so necessarie a parte in your diuision, or elles haue made no diuision at all. For howe well you haue thynen in seekinge by suche distribution and diuision, to enlarge your treatise of the Popes supzremacie, hath, I trust, longe ere nowe evidently appeered to the discrete Readers, by your former treatie, of the Necessitie of one onely heade of Christes whole Church here in earthe. In the whiche whole procelle, there is no one authoritie by M. Dozma alleaged, that maketh for the proufe of his proposition, *Of the necessitie of one heade of Christes whole Church*, but they altogether do make for the authoritie of euery bishop in his owne seueral Church or Diocesse. In the proufe whereof, as a matter to al men knowen, & by all men

The Bishop of Rome is temporal lorde, rather than a priest, or Bishop.

confessed, as **D.** Dorman might well haue spared his paines: so farre better might he haue spared his greater paines in this processe, moze then twise as long as the other, in the mooste parte of the whiche, he tra-uaileth to proue, that to appertaine to Priestes, whiche to learned and godly Priestes was neuer yet by any man denied.

*Dorman fol. 15.*

**G**regorius Nazianzenus, that auncient father and maister to **S.** Hierom, in a certeine oration that he made, of the seemely order that ought to be in Christes Church, hath these wordes, *Nemo delphinum vidit terram fulcantem neque bouem in vnda laborantem, quemadmodum nec solem in nocte crescentem, siue lunam interdiu, ignis flammam emittentem, whiche is in Englishe to saie thus muche. There is no man that euer sawe the Dolphin, forsakinge the sea plowe the lande, or the Oxe leaue the earthe to swimme and labour in the water, no more then the Sonne in the night risinge or falling, or the Moone in the daie shininge. And as these kepe the order and course to them by God and Nature appoincted, the Dolphin the water, the Oxe the lande, the Sonne the daie, the Moone the nighte, without entermedlinge themselues either in others function: so is there (saith he) in Christes Church an order taken, that one halbe a head to rule and geue counsell, some other in place of feete to goe, some handes to worke, other some eares to heare, and eyes to see, some shepherdes to fede, other some sheepe to be fedde, some in one office, some in an other. This mooste be wisesfull order in Christes Church, is on our behalves (as many as wilbe accounted members thereof) inuitaly to be obserued, onlesse in obedience to varden our Creator, we will by brute beastes suffer our selues to be vanquished and ouercome. This is the order, whereupon dependeth the velfare or illfare of the whole worlde. This is that order whiche so longe as it remaineth*

In oratio  
de model  
in discip  
tat. 1060

whole

Whole and not broken, so long common weales flourish, so long vniuersitie and peace are nourished, so long Christes true Religion triumpheth: as contrariwise, the breach thereof, (when the feete that shoulde goe, will usurpinge the office of the head, presume to geue counsell, the eyes will heare, the eares will be eyes, the head will goe, the sheepe feede their sheperdes, the scholer teache the maister) is in verie deepe, the breakenecke of all good order and common quietnes. This is that orderly coniunction of one member with an other, and euery one in his owne place, whiche although it be, and euer hath bene, a great mote in satans eye: yet neuer durst he or any of his, directly impugne it. And therefore hath he by those his ministers, whome in these our daies he hath stirred vp against Christ and his truth, founde out suche a bye waie, as whereby he may both remove this lett which hindereth so muche his course, and seeme yet neuer thelesse, to stande stoutely in the defence thereof. For what? dooe our aduersaries trowe you, expressely mainteine that order is naught, that the scholer shoulde teache the maister, the sheepe feede their sheperdes, that thinges shoulde be so iumbled together, and suche a hochepot made of all estates, that it shoulde be lawfull for euery man to comptroll, one an other in his office? No no, they be wiser then so I warrant you. For although in deepe all their driftes tend to that ende, yet couet they to make men beleue, that they minde nothinge lesse. For if they shoulde openly pretend so muche, then were the matter at an ende, and their credite viterly losie. And therefore for the sauegarde thereof, they woulde cast before our eyes such a mist, that we shoulde beleue, those that be in verie deepe scholers to be maisters, sheepe to be sheperdes, the feete to be the heads, and the head to be the feete, and that vnder such gouernement, there were of order no breach at all.

Nowell.

The title of this booke of Gregorie Pazianzene Shoberly, that he treateth of the order and modestie that is

What order it is, that Nazianzene spekeeth of Nazian. *ibidē.*

Ex. I. Cor. 14.

to be kepte in Ecclesiasticall disceptations or disputacions. This kinde of disputacions Ecclesiasticall he sheweth to be the same that S. Paule calleth Prophecie, by these very wordes. *Prophete duo vel tres loquantur idq; vicissim, & vnus interpretetur, alio vero declarante primus cedat. &c.*

That is to say, let ij. or iij. Prophetes speake & that by course, and let one interpretate or expoude, & when the other maketh declaratton let the first geue place: thus far Nazianzen. In this propheticke or Ecclesiasticall disputation, Nazianzen forbiddeth none of y<sup>e</sup> Laitie to speake and giue their aduise, but teacheth them modestie in speakinge, as both the Title of the booke beinge of Modestie in suche reasoning to be kept, sheweth, & may also appeare moze plainely in these his wordes: *sane si vir es secundum Christum, sensusq; habeas exercitatos &c.* That is to

De modestia in discept. *tenēd.*

Vir secundum Christum.

si vero adhuc paruulus es &c. ut cū sublimioribus progrediaris.

saye, If thou be in deede a man growen in Christe, and hast good vnderstandinge, and the light of knowledge doth shine vnto thee, speake wisdom which is vttered amongst the perfect &c. But if thou be yet but a litle one or childe, and in vnderstandinge creepeinge vpon the grounde, neither hable to goe forwarde with higher & greater Clerkes (or matters) become a Corinthiane, let milke nourishe thee, why seekest thou moze stronger meate, which thy stomake can not digest, to make no-

Nazianzene permitte a simple mā to speak in matters of religion, if he haue any good thing to viter.

si ergo mihi ob-

riusment of, by reason of thy weakenes: yet speake if thou haue any thing to good to be kepte vnspoken, and so forth. These be Nazianzenes wordes who excepteth none, though children in vnderstanding, from speaking of matters of Religion, so it be good that they shall speake. And Nazianzene concluding this Oratton, and

exhorting al yonge men, old men, people, Princes, subiectes, &c, in such Ecclesiasticall disputacions to auoide

super-

superfluous and vnprofitable contentions, doth thereby  
 geue vs to vnderstande, that it was lawfull for the said  
 subiectes not onely Princes, for yonge men, not onely  
 olde men, &c. soberly to say their mindes, in causes Ec-  
 clestiall. He, and Nazianzene much blameth suche as  
 in maters of Religion doe preferre them selves befoze all  
 men and doe plainely play the Emperours & Tyrants,  
 and will geue place to no man. But how M. Dorman  
 and Hosius, with the rest of these Romanistes doe agree  
 with this order of Nazianzene in this place, may well  
 appeare by the wordes by M. Dorman borrowed out of  
 Hosius, and by Hosius taken out of a certaine Ora-  
 tion of Basilus the Emperour in these very wordes.  
 Of you that are Laymen whether you be suche as haue dignities in  
 the Common weale or none: I haue no more to say, but that in no  
 wise it is lawfull for you to dispute or reason of causes Ecclesiasti-  
 call &c. these are the wordes in M. Dormans booke. Ho-  
 sius dothe further p̄sequite the same matter by these  
 wordes: A Lay mā be he of neuer so great holines and wisdomē:  
 yea though he excel in al vertue yet is it not lawfull for him (as Bas-  
 silus the Emperour thinketh) once to mooue any talke of causes or  
 maters Ecclesiasticall because that is the proper office of a Bishop  
 though he be muche inferiour in vertue and wisdomē. These be  
 Hosius wordes vpon the said Basilus the Emperours  
 Oratio: which wordes of y<sup>e</sup> Prince vtterly vnskillful in  
 any learninge, Holy, or Prophane, Hosius doth allowe  
 as moste good and godly, and M. Dorman in this his  
 booke allegeth and alloweth the same as very notable.  
 And thus where Gregozie Nazianzene in this place by  
 M. Dorman alleaged, dooth permitte the simplest and  
 vnlarnedst man in the Church to speake in matters  
 of Religion, & forbiddeth pride & tyzannie to the holiest  
 and

uenes & senes,  
 &c. Superua-  
 cuas cōiētiones  
 valere sinceris.

Naxian. In Ser-  
 monibus de Deo  
 se cunctis pra-  
 ferre hominibus  
 & plane impe-  
 ratorem & Ty-  
 rannum agere.

Dor. fol. 23. 2.  
 Ex Hosij lib. 2.  
 fol. 118.

Quātacūq; re-  
 ligione sit &

sapientia laicus

The Papiſts wit  
 suffer no laye  
 man to dispute  
 or once to speke  
 of causes Eccle-  
 siasticall, be he  
 neuer so holye,  
 wise, learn-  
 ed, and greate  
 in dignitie.

Hosius. f. 118.

Basilij Imperat.

Oratio pijsima.

Dorman. f. 23.

How contrary

the Papiſts are

to Nazianzen,

here by M. Dor-

man alleaged.

and best learned, these men contend that it is not lawfull, no not for a Christian Prince, be he neuer so learned, wise, holie, and excellent in all vertue, once to moue any talke of matters, or causes Ecclesiasticall, though the Bishoppes be to him muche inferiour in learninge, wisdome, and vertue. And the better to frame the worlde to this their purpose, that whole disceptation or prophetic, this whole ordre of the Church by S. Paule ordeined, by Pazianzene here allowed, and in the Primitiue Church vsed, is by these Romanistes cleane taken away out of the Church of Christe: and yet they complaine vpon vs for breakinge of order in that thinge, the whiche whole thinge it selfe, with all the order thereof they haue cleane taken away, and thrust out of Christes Church altogether. Neither is this good order of the Primitiue Church by Pazianzene here allowed, onely taken away by these men, but also a great disorder by Pazianzene reprobued, is by the same Papistes brought into the Church and Religion of Iesus Christe.

*Sermonē mouere*

The whole thinge with all the order thereof, that Nazianzene here speaketh of, is by the Pope and his cleargie not onely cleane thrust out of Christes church:

But also the disorder by Nazianzene disprayed, is brought into Christes church by the Papistes.

*Ex Aristotilis artibus artes male &c. non secus ac flagella quaedam Aegyptiaca.*

Philosophy, and humane artes brought into Religion, are as witchcrafts and plagues of Aegypt, by Nazianzenes iudgemēt

Pazianzene sheweth that a kinde of captious, curious, and subtile reasoninge after Chrysippus, Aristotle, Plato, and other Philosophers artes; whiche in matters of Religion, he calleth naughtie artes, and bewitchinges of Eloquence and Philosophie, begunne in his time to creepe into the Church. Whereof as S. Paule forewarned vs to beware, so doth Pazianzene lament, that suche subtelties, as certaine Egyptians plagues, began in his time to make an entrie into treaties of religion: who, were he nowe liuinge, and did see the Diuinitie disputacions of our Scholemen, of Scotistes, Thomistes, and suche like, as farre inferiour

our in all good learninge and eloquence to those in Nazianzenes time, so farre excellinge all Aristotles and Platoces in captious curiositie, beinge in deede nothing elles but barbarous subtelties, and curious trifles to be learned with much labour, and losse of time, with the losse of god learninge, and all godlines withall, where- with of late times our whole Religion was ouerwhelmed, woulde he not, thinke you, affirme that all the plagues of Egyp̄te had oppressed vs at once: From the whiche plagues, emongst other many most abhominable abuses, and errours, the light of the Gospell by Goddes grace clearly shininge in our daies, hath partly deliuered vs, and shall I truste, shortly set vs fully free from them. And thus these men takinge away that good ordze, whereof Nazianzene here speaketh, and bringinge in such disorders as are by him here condemned, are not ashamed by Nazianzenes wordes to charge vs with Breake of all god and comely ordze. But if M. Doorman will nedes drawe Nazianzenes wordes to ordze broken by suche as doe leaue their owne dueties, and inuade other mens offices, as resembled by the similitudes of the Delphine plowinge, & the Ore swimminge, the Sunne by night, the Moone by day shining, the fate desiring the place of the head, &c. It is euident that this disordze is by the Pope, & Papisstes them selues of all other men most vled, & that all comelie order is by them most diolated & broken. With them, the Bishop of one Citie & Diocesse (that is one membze of the Bodie) wil nedes be the onely head of the whole Church: with them the Delphine leauing the water, wil nedes plow the lande: & the Ore forsakinge the lande, will swimme in the water: that is: the Pope by his office & vocation

The Scotistes, and Thomistes subtelties infinitely passage the Egyptian plagues of Nazianzenes time.

Plagues of Egyp̄t takē away by the Gospell.

The Papisstes charge vs with their owne faultes.

The Pope and his Clergy, doe cause the Delphine to plow, and the Ore to swimme.

The Pope hath forsaken the office of a Bishop. *à Math. 20.*  
*Scitis quia principes gentium dominantur illis*  
*Ec. nō ita erit inter vos. Ec.*

*h 1. Petr. 5.*  
*Neg; cen dominū exercentes aduersus cle- vos. Ec.*

*1 Eph. 6.*  
 The Pope putteth vp the spirituall sworde, and draweth the temporall sworde.

*à Math. 26.*  
 The Pope claymeth both the swordes.

*•* The Popish Cleargy doth clayme exemptions and immunities from subiection to Princes.

*•* The Popes prelates haue forsaken the offices of Priests.

being but a Bishop of one diocesse, and one of the Clergie, forsakynge his minifferie in the Church, will nādes cōtrarie to the expresse doctrine of the *•* Scriptures, and contrary to the sentence of Nazianzene, and all other ancient doctours, be a temporall Lord, yee Lord of al the world, forsaking the humilitie appertainyng to an Ecclesiasticall minister, will treade vpon kinges & Emperours neckes, will haue them kisse his foete, holde his bzidle, & stay his stirroppe, like gentlemen of his stable: forsaking the pulpette, and the office of preachinge, the ministringe of the Sacramentes, the studie of the holy Scriptures, & other ecclesiasticall dueties, hath in steede of them, to doe with Castels, gunnes, hozses, Harneies, Souldiers, Watres &c. cōtrary to *•* S. Peters doctrine (whose successour he would be) forbiddinge men of the Chuth such dominion, & putting vp into the scabert the *•* spirituall sworde of Gods worde, which mē of *•* cleargie specially are commaunded to drawe, doth draw the *•* temporal sworde, which *•* Peter (as he saith) his predecesour, was cōmaunded to put vp. And not contented himselfe to challenge both *•* swordes of ecclesiasticall & temporal Jurisdiction, doth plucke the temporall sworde out of Princes hāds, in such sort, *•* as thei may not vse it, no not in temporall causes, against any his Popelinges, though they be thēues, felōs, or traitours, & thus vsurpunge after sondrie sortes vpon kinges & princes right most evidently, yet doth he, & his sworne cleargie, complaine vpon princes as vsurpers, bitinge & whininge both at once as they say. Neither doth the head of *•* Popish Synagoge him selfe alone in this sorte breake all comely ordie, *•* but also his Prelates doe in likewise the same. His Cardinals originally, & by their proper office, Persons, Vicars, & Curates, (*•* is inferiour membez

(in the bodie) leaning the cures of their parish churches, wil needes be Princes Paeres, yea & their Superiours; that is to say, heades not onely of the bodies, but of the heades also, and other Prelates likewise leauinge their peculiar vocatiōs, some of them be Embassadours, some Lordes deputies, Lordes leuuetenautes, some of them lordes Chauncelours, & iudges in all tempozall causes, & affaires: all of them in al shoue and behauiour alwaies moze like tempozal Lordes of this woꝛld, or any thinge els, rather than spirituall ministers of Christes church: litle regarding the examles of the Sunne & the Moone. Whereby Priests and Princes are warned (as saith D. Dormā) to keepe them selves without intermedling eithether in others function. And so the offices of priests & Princes, which thei do euery where affirme to be so distincte and diuers, that they may by no meanes be confounded, & do crie out against tempozall, lay, meere lay, and meere tempozall Princes, whan they seeme to approche neare to their spirituall regiment, are by these spirituall men, bzeakinge into all ciuill, tempozall, lay, meere tempozal, and meere lay offices, confounded, and all orde by them selves vtterly broken. Whiche thinge being too well knowen to be kept secreete in these daies, as not done, they beginne now a preparatiō to defende as well and lawfully done. And D. Hardinge is not abashed to affirme, *That by the exāple of Moses beinge not onely a ciuill Magistrate, but also a Priest, the Pope may rule tēporally, but not that a king may rule spiriuually.* And it had been meete ly wel, if his holines had so made a medlie of his temporalitie with summe spiriualitie, but in dede the rule of the Pope and his Prelates hath bene of longe time so tempozall, that they sozgate al, not onely true, but even

The confusion and breach of al order made by the Papistes.

Hard. Confur. Apol. fol. 298. 299. 301. & 312.

D. Hard. Confur. Apol. fol. 305. a. b.

The Pope both Prieste and Prince, may rule bothe tēporally and spiriually, saithe D. Hard,

The Pope and his Prelates wholly tēporall, in nothing spirituall.

their owne popishe spiritnalitie also wholly: who either by intollerable pride, disdain, or by impoztune busines in woꝛldly affaires lacke leasure, or by dull slouthfulness haue no luste, not onely to pꝛeache, and minister the Sacramentes, as is by Gods lawe cōmaunded thē, but also not to do so muche as to mumble their Masse, (wherein yet they place the whole summe of their Popishe Religion) but bequeath the same, as an office vniwoꝛthy for so honozable Prelates, to scēlie soule pꝛæstes, & other sir Johns, their Chaplaines. A manifest argument, y either they esteeme not in deede, their Masse as so high, holsome, holie & spirituall a thinge, as they would haue others to beleue it is, or that if they do so esteeme it, there is no care of any Religion at all in these spiritual Prelates, so seldome vsing the pꝛincipall pointe, or rather whole summe of their popishe spiritual superstition. The poꝛe Pꝛæstes likewise haue left their office of pꝛeachinge by God appointed them, as well as their Prelates, & wholly giuen them selues, to masking, & mumminge, to Sozcerie, & coniuringe of fire, water, bread, bowes, & other baggage, & their Deacons leauing the care of the poꝛe, peculiarly to them appointed by the Scriptures, do nothing els but stande by the pꝛæst, when he is at Masse, & singe, or reade the Gospell in a language, which neither them selues, nor their hearers do vnderstande. And thus all comely ordꝛe requisite, in the ordꝛely downg of euery mans peculiar office and duettie, (with the breach whereof these men falsely charge vs) is by them selves in deede, most shamefully violated, and vtterly broken, and defaced in all pointes. And in the meane reason whiles those presumptuous Prelates, of humble ministers of the Church,

will

What is to be thought vpon the Popes and his Prelates so seldome sayinge of Masse.

The poore pꝛiestes in the Papacie haue forsaken their office also.

will needes become Princes Peeres, and Superiours, they disdeine that Christian princes should in Christs Church have ought at all to doo, but thinke it reason, that what soever they shal say, appoint, or commaunde in Religion (whiche yet is no part of their study) must by all persons, Princes and other, without any enquire, or question, without examination, or grudge, be straight beleued, solowed, and obeyed. For this is the comely order, whiche not Pazlanzene, but M. Dorman and his felowes would haue: els forsooth, should Princes being but the secte (by M. Dormans doctrine) take vpon them to be heads, and so breake the order, whiche the Papistes accompt for comely. For who els be those, whome you M. Dorman doo affirme that of secte we would haue to be beleued to be the heades, but Christiã Princes: though Pazlanzene doo compare the simplest, and vnlearnest men, and verie childzen, and babes, in vnderstanding creeping vpon the grounde, to the secte: though Hosius your authour, reasoning not against Princes onely, but against the common people also, thought he might fætlie apply the terme of secte to the, as hauing no iudgement in matters of Religion: be you neuer so loth to leaue any worde of him not placed, in some place of your booke; yet shoulde you haue had so muche consideration, as to haue spared the vse of that terme in this place, and treatie of Princes. For we cõtend onely for the superiortie due to Christiã Princes, for the whiche you saie, wee will haue Princes of the secte, to be the heades. Haue you suche an opinion of Princes, and of the Pope, and his prelates, that your Pope must be the head, his prelates the eyes, and other principall partes the bodie, and Princes the secte:

D. Hard. cõfur.  
Apolo. fol. 302. a  
& 304.

Christian Prin-  
ces the secte, by  
M. Dormãs do-  
ctrine,

Hosius li. 2. fo. 43  
45. 47. 52. & 65.  
& præcipue. 113.  
b. & 127.

Hosius speaking  
of the common  
people, cõpareth  
them, to the  
secte in the bo-  
dy: M. Dorman  
thinketh he  
may likewise,  
compare Prin-  
ces to the secte.

In what estimation the Pope hath Christian Princes.

*Paulus Epistola ad Philemonem.*

Christiā Princes occasioned by the Pope & his prelates to break order, haue yet kepte order, vvhich thei haue broken.

D. Hard. cōfut. Apolo. fol. 298. b. 299. a. & .300. a.

els tell me what other secte be they, whome we would haue to be the heades, but onely Princes, that is to say, every one within his owne dominions? But what doo I require an answer of M. Dozman, whome he meaneth by the teete? the Pope him self treading the Emperour vnder his teete, and admitting all kinges, and Princes to the kisse of his teete (thus folowing the example of our Sautour, washinge his Disciples teete, like a good Vicar) aunswereth me moſte effectually, not in woordes onely, but in deedes also. If Onesimus of a seruaunt, or bound man, by Christianitie became his maisters or Lordes brother, I doo marueill that the Pope would haue all Emperours, kynges, and Princes, by Christianitie to be brought to so bale ſlauerie, & that all Papistes doo so mainteine the same. By which examples of moſte vniust and intollerable wronges, & presumptions, of the Cleargie, if Princes iustly occasioned, should either exempt them selues, from all Iurisdiction of all Ecclesiastical persons, as is euery Popishe Priest, Monke, Frater, Nunne, exempted from the Iurisdiction of Princes: or if Princes should desire any vndue office or honour, and would claime to be priests, as well as Princes, (as in deed they doo not.) Though D. Harding, M. Dozman, and other suche, doo moſte vnrualie reporte of them, as though they so did. If such disorde, I say, should happen amongst Tempozall Princes, with what colour yet could any popishe priest, Monke, or Frater, being exempted from all Iurisdiction of Princes, complaine, that Princes did exempte them selues, from the Iurisdiction of Priestes? Or with what face, could any Popishe Prelate, finde fault that Princes would be Priestes, seinge they of Priestes haue

have so long claimed, and presumed to be Princes, and Princes Peeres, and the Doope their headdes, to be Prince of all Princes: If Princes ~~that~~ have likewise broken into the right of priestes, as the Pope and his Prelates have broken into the righte, and Jurisdiction of Princes, yet might they by reason seeme rather to have recepent, than to have doon wrong: and to have caused wrong doers to suffer right, by doing to them, as they have doon to others: by measuring to them, as they have measured to others: by breakynge order, with order breakers: by vsurping vpon vsurpers. But blessed be God, who hath geuen suche moderation to Christian Princes, that they (though vpon so great occasion by the Pope, his Prelates, and Priestes, to them geuen) woulde not yeat so deale with them as gayne, as they have dealt with Princes. For had there not been moze moderation in Princes, than was in the Pope and his Prelates herein, but that comely order noted here out of Piazanzene, had likewise by them, as it hath by the Pope, his Prelates and priestes, been broken, all had or now by disozdre and confusion, been turned vpside downe.

It is iustice to suffer, as one hath done, and to haue the same measure whiche he hath vsed himselfe to measure with.

That all is not brought to disorder and confusion, cometh of the moderation of Christian Princes.

Dorman. Fol. 16.

*This is no newe or straunge practise good Christian Readers, but vsed euen from the beginning, and continu'd daillie, by that olde enemye to mankinde, and Willy serpent the Deuill, to set vpryce and ouerthrowe vertue. Thus cloaketh he pryde with the name of Clenlinesse, Couetousnesse he termeth Frugalitie, Prodigalitie Liberalitie, Adulterie in other menne solace, in Priestes and suche as haue vowed the contrarie, & he couereth it with the honourable title of Matrimonie: Althoughe the aunciente fathers*

\* Translated  
word for worde  
out of the .4.  
booke of Hosi,  
whose vwoordes  
are these: **G**

fathers of Christs Church, haue not doubted, some of them to call a ad virg  
it, not as doo the Devils ministers marriage, but adulterie: as dothe laplam.  
S. Ambrose a S. Basil b and Theophilaetus: c some of them, as S. Hie- b. in o  
rom, d S. Austen, e and Christostom, f not adulterie onely, as dooe the de virgi  
other, but sacrilege and incest. c. in cap  
i. Cor.

**A**mbrosius, Basilus, Theophilaetus, vocant hoc genus nup- d. li. i. c  
tias adulteriū: Hieronymo, Augustino, Christostomo visum tra Iouin  
est, non satis pro eo ac ipsius turpitude mereatur, facinus id e. li. de  
appellari, si vocassent id adulterium: itaque peius quiddam no vid. c  
adulterio, hoc est, incestum sacrilegium eas nuptias appel- f. Epist.  
landas putauerunt &c. Fol. 216. b. Theodo  
lapsum.

Nowell.

**W**hy continue you **M.** Dozman, to charge vs with  
your owne faultes: It is no newe or straunge deuise,  
but an olde practise of Sathans, and still continued in  
the Popishe Synagoge, to cloke all vices vnder the  
names of vertues. Under y cloke of the honour of God  
and his Church, the Pope and his prelacte couer their  
presumptuous lordlines and dominion by a Chrifte, and  
his holy Apostles Peter and Paule to the Clergie for-  
biddē. b Their cruell tyrannie, they terme fatherly cor-  
rectio. c Their couetousnes, whereby they haue scraped  
together the best part of the possessions of this worlde,  
they mainteine vnder the pretense of Peters patrimo-  
nie, & right of holy Church. d And by selling of all holy  
and unholy thinges for money, of the temple of God  
they haue made a denne of theues. And thus doinge,  
name them selues the Vicars of Christ, who cast suche  
marchautes out of his temple: e and the successours of  
Peter, the dispiser of siluer & gould. Surfeiting in fishe  
meates, deuouring of al delicates, and bibbing of swēte  
wynes, they haue termed fasting, True prater vnto the  
eternall

a Math. 20.  
i. Tim. 3.  
i. Pet. 5.  
Nō dominā. &c.  
b i. Timoth. 3.  
Oportet episco-  
pum modestum  
esse non percuf-  
forem. ibidem.  
c i. Pet. 5.  
Nō turpiter af-  
fectantes lucrū.  
d Math. 21.  
Luc. 19.  
Vos autem fe-  
cistis speluncam  
latronum.  
e Act. 3. a. b.  
Act. 8. d. 20. pe-  
cunia tua tecū  
s; in pdicionē.

eternall liuing God, haue they turned into the inuoca-  
tion of dead men, and into mindeles mumling of their  
mattins, and masses, mingled with fables and blasphe-  
mies. Under the cloke of celibat, & bowes of chastitie,  
they haue defiled them selues with whoredomes, adul-  
teries, and other vncleanlines not to be named: contra-  
rie to the Scriptures, willinge them to liue with their  
owne wiues in all chastitie. And thus as though they  
were men of perfect puritie, they do with all reproches  
reuite such, as accoordinge to the doctrine of the <sup>a</sup> Scrip-  
tures, & allowance of the auncient holy Fathers, <sup>b</sup> and  
councels, do liue chastely with their owne wiues. For  
this is that marke, that *M. Doorman* in his rounge and  
compassinge, doth chiefly shote at. And some sælic Pa-  
pistes sæinge him thus dashinge in with his doctours  
on an heape, do meruaile, I belæue, that he him selfe is  
not doctour also, shewing him selfe so woꝛthie thereof,  
but remaineth in the inferiour degrée of a Bachiler so  
longe. Whereas others vnderstandinge, that all this  
diuinitie was learned not in fixe yeres studie, but in  
the readinge of fixe lines, findinge the like practise  
throughtout his whole booke, will iudge that he hath  
come, as by his diuinitie, so by his degrée in the same,  
sarre moze easely than other men, (who haue not the  
like gifte of facillitie) can do. This matter *M. Door-*  
*man* findinge readie framed to his hande in *Hosius*,  
coude not suffer it, though nothinge pertinent to this  
his purposed matter, to scape him, but muste needes  
trãslate it woꝛde for woꝛde into this place of his booke,  
as the learned in the Latine tongue may by *Hosius* his  
woꝛdes by me adioyned to *M. Doormans*, wel perceiue.  
Neither hath *M. Doorman* onely the same last numbꝛe

i. Timoth. 3.  
Oportet episco-  
pum esse irre-  
prehensibilem  
vnius vxoris vi-  
rum. &c.

a i. Corinth. 7.

i. Timoth. 3.

Ambros. in eū-  
dem locum.

b Can. 50. Apost.  
Paphuntius cū  
cōcil. Nicæno.

Sozom. li. i. c. 23.

Cōc. 3. Carthag.

Cone. Ancyran.

Cōcil. Gan-  
grense.

*Hosius* lib. 4.  
fol. 216. b. versus  
finem.

of doctours but in the very same order also: & hath made them by diuision *ter geminos iusse*, as hath Hosius donne. After which sort, it is no hard matier for M. Dozman to write not Bachlerlike onely, but doctourlike also: yea & Cardinallike too, if it be, as in dæde it is, his pleasure so to do, throughout all this treatie. And Hosius in dæde hath these wordes towards y<sup>e</sup> latter ende of his fourth booke, in his treatie of bowes, a place not vnnæte therfore. But M. Dozman hath translated the same into the beginning of his second treatie, *of the head of the Church to be a prieste*, very aptly, I doubt not, as he thinketh: but aptly, or vnaptly, he cared not where he placed Hosius his authours sayinges, so he were sure to place the some where. And these notes out of Hosius by M. Dozman translated into this impertinent place, either for that they appertaine nothing to the present matier, or for y<sup>e</sup> these doctours say nothinge here them selves, but onely a short tale is in their names tolde by M. Dozmã, Hosius his name, whose in dæde it is, being suppressed, I might iustly passe ouer in silence, vntil M. Dozman doe bringe in y<sup>e</sup> said doctours, speaking in their owne wordes: but I will in the meane time aduertise the good Readers, y<sup>e</sup> the doctours here by M. Dozmã out of Hosius reherfed, as S. Ambrose, Chrysostome, & Theophilactus, write against Ponkes & Ponnnes, such as our ecclesiastical ministers, thanks be to God, are none. The titles of the bookes, *Ad virginem lapsam. ad Theodorum lapsam*, that is, to a Ponne fallen, to Theodozus a Pöke fallē: to witte, by whoz edome (as doe our Popishe votaries vsually now) doe declare the persons & matiers, that they doe write of, nothinge to appertaine to our ministerie. Which pour authoz Hosius alleagynge those doctours, onely against Ponkes

It is more easie to write, thã to ryde Cardinal like.

M. Dormans disposition of matiers.

Ad Vir. lapsam.  
Ad Theodorū  
lapsum.  
In. I. Corinth. 7.

Hosius lib. 4.  
contra Breatiū.

Monkes and Nonnes, might haue taught you, list you haue seene any moze, than the marginall note, whiche onely you caught & runne away with, to frame thereof this impertinent patch of your treatie.

• S. Basil, b S. Hierome, with al y rest here by you named, & bisides thē, c S. Cyprian, d Clemēs Alexandrinus, & e Epiphanius, with many other auncient holy fathers agræpyng to the e Scriptures, willinge al persons without exception to marrie, y without mariage cā not liue chastly in body & minde, would rather haue such as vndiscretly had bowed, to marie, than to liue in such beastly abominations, as y most parte of your popish botaries do. Neither the auncient fathers onely, but the best learned of your s popithe doctours of latter time, vnderstandinge the beastly life that you leade, be of the same minde.

And y S. Augustine, whome you amongst other auncient doctours do here name, doth expzely affirme, y the matrimonie of suche as had bowed, is true mariage: & that those who diuorze such (as vsually now you papistes do) do offend græuoussly. And your authour i Hosius cōfesseth with, Est ita, it is so, y S. Augustine so saith: Whether though you neuer looked in S. Augustine, yet might your Hosius haue taught you, not thus at once both to belie S. Augustine, in sayinge that he called it not mariage, where he doth call it mariage: and also to call him the Deuilles minister, for so callinge it: for you say they be the Deuilles ministers, that so call it.

h Further y doctours here by you named, with a great nūbe mo bisides, declaring at large in their woꝝkes, y bowes ought to be made aduisedly, discretly, fræly, cōstantly, without all woꝝldly respect: vpon onely loue of chastitie, & zeale to serue God moze purely and quietly,

a Basil. de virginitate.

b Hieron. Ad Demetriadē.

c Cyprian. lib. 1. epist. 11. Ad Pōponium.

d Clemēs Alexandrinus. Pedag. lib. 2. cap. 10.

e Epiphani<sup>o</sup> li. 2. To. 1. Hæres. 61.

f 1. Corinth. 7. Quis nō cōtinent, nubant:

Meli<sup>o</sup> enī ē nubere, q̄vri. &c.

g Panormitanus de clericis cōiugatis cap. Cum olim.

Aeneas Syluius post pius. 29.

Platina. Faber Stapulensis.

h August. de bono viduitatis ca.

10. & ex Gratiano dist. 27. cap.

Quidā nubētes.

i Hosius lib. 4. fol. 217. a.

Sed August. ait, nihilomin<sup>o</sup> has

esse nuptias cōtēdit, nec à mar-

ritis separari vxo-

res, quasi adulteras permittit,

Amb. li. 1.  
virginib<sup>o</sup>  
heophila-  
us in. 1.  
or. 7.  
piph. cō-  
a Mōtan.  
æref. 48.  
61. lib. 9.  
om. 1.  
origines in  
rba Pauli  
e q̄ pl<sup>o</sup> fa-  
iat, q̄ o-  
ortet fa-  
ere.

(foz other vowes they allow none) do plainly giue vs to vnderstande that your popishe vowes, wherunto by force, and fraude, by promise of woꝛldly rewarde, & liuinge, yonge men, and maidens, y<sup>e</sup> boies and girles almost, beide of all discretion and constancie, haue bene either compelled, oꝛ intised, are in dede no vowes, (though you falsely so terme them) but holie halters, and sinnefull snares, wherein your craftie Romishe fores haue intangled such vnskilful youth. And that likewise such, as beinge of greater age, but of small discretion, and lesse honestie and vertue, haue taken vpo them the saide vowes, vpon hope of woꝛldly rewarde, and pleasant idle life, rather then vpo any zeale to serue God in puritie and cleanness, (which by their impure and vncleane life they do plainly declare to the whole woꝛlde) the same doctours I say, do giue vs to vnderstade, that such, how so euer you cloke the matter, do not in dede make any vowes to be rendered to God, but foolish and faithlesse promises, displeasunt to God, and most contrary to the ancient doctours mindes: and therefore no more to be perfoꝛmed, than was Heroddes wicked promise made to Herodias daughter, as beinge no lesse causes of all filthines, than was his promise cause of mosse cruell murther, but are to be broken, as displeasunt to God, and made against all the ancient doctours mindes, rather than by any sentence of theirs to be mainteined. Wherefoꝛe cease to alleage the seuerer sayinges of those auncient Doctours, foꝛ the maintenance of your popishe, foolish, and faithles promises, whose wholesome counnelles in the making therof, you woulde neuer folowe, but haue euer refused, and despised the same. Muche more fondly do you alleage their

sayinges.

Eccle. 5.

Math. 14. 2. 7.

saynges against our Cleargie of England, who neuer  
 made any bowe of soole or sengle life, & therefore be in  
 dedde no botaries at all. And we vnderstanding by the  
 very same <sup>a</sup> Doctours by you here named & by <sup>b</sup> Ignatius,  
<sup>c</sup> Clemens, <sup>d</sup> Irenius, <sup>e</sup> Clemens Alexandrinus,  
<sup>f</sup> Gregorie Nazianzene, Epiphanius, and others, with  
 sondrie <sup>g</sup> histories Ecclesiastical, that the holy Apostles  
 all sauing Paule and Iohn, or as some saye, sauing on-  
 ly Iohn, had wiues, and that a great numbze of moske  
 godly Bishops and Martyrs in the primitive Church  
 likewise were married: yea and that moe Bishoppes,  
 foure hundzeth yeeres after Chryste, in S. Hieromes  
 time, were married than vnmarried: and that the ma-  
 riage of Ecclesiasticall Ministers continued ever in ho-  
 nour in the Church of God in the olde lawe, and in the  
 Church of Chryste in Greece, from the beginninge to  
 this date: and in the Church of Germanie and Eng-  
 lande also, a thousand yeeres after our sauour Chryste:  
 and that therefore your forced celibate in comparisson to  
 the antiquitie and continuance of the marriage of Ec-  
 clesiasticall ministers, is but a newe inuention of Po-  
 pish tyrannie: we I say, consideringe the premises,  
 haue chosen rather to folowe the doctrine of the holy  
 Scriptures, the doctrine and examples of the holy Apo-  
 stles, and of all the said holy Bishoppes and Martyrs,  
 of the primitive church of Chryste, in honest and ho-  
 nourable Matrimonte, than to be like your Popish bo-  
 taries, in all abomination and detestation of most fil-  
 thie and damnable life: litle regarding your vilanous  
 reuilings, as nothing touching our lafull marriages,  
 maintained by Gods woorde, but belwasping the filthy  
 flames, smoldering within your polluted and adultered

<sup>a</sup> Ambrosius in  
 verba Pauli. de-  
 spondi vos. &c.  
 Chrysostom. in  
 epist. Pauli: ad  
 Timoth. & Tit.  
 & Homil. 7. in  
 Math. & homil.  
 de beato Philo-  
 gonio.

<sup>b</sup> Ad Philadel-  
ph.

<sup>c</sup> Teste Eusebio.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. i. ca. 9.

<sup>e</sup> Stromat. li. 3.

<sup>f</sup> In oratione fu-  
nebri patris.

<sup>g</sup> Sozom. lib. 7.  
cap. 11. de Spiri-  
dione, &c.

<sup>h</sup> Hieron. ad  
Oceanum.

<sup>i</sup> Alber. Crantz<sup>o</sup>  
lib. 4. ca. 43.

Nauc. gen. 93.

Lamb. Schaph-  
naburgensis.

Polid. Verg. In

vita regis Edgari

& de inuentor.

lib. 5. cap. 4.

Henr. Hunting.

li. 7.

From whēce the vncleanlie talke and writting of the Papists doth procede. D. Harding hath blotted his whole booke of the Confut. of the Apolo. with such treaties, as fol. 7. b. 10. b. 15. 179. a. 160. b. 238 a. 323. a. 347. a. & in many other places.

myndes, out of the whiche these stinkinge smokes of your vncleane wordes, most māte for suche mouthes, doo continually bzeath and bzeake out against Goddes most honest & honorable ordinaūce, who in his time, we doubt not, will auenge his, & our commen quarel & iniurie, vpon his, & our commō aduerfaries and enemies.

Doiman. Folio. 16.

*This practise I saie of the Diuell their fathers, do those his ministers most diligently imitate those clawebackes and Princes parasites, whose fauour when they labour to winne, that vnder the shadow therof, their heresie may finde the better entreteinement, and to the poisoning of the world the freer passage, they vse to them these pernicious persuasions, that they be here in earth by almighty God placed in his church, to be the heads therof, and not membres, to be fathers and not children, to rule in causes of Religion, and not to be ruled, that to them it belongeth in the right of their crowne, to approve doctrine or to condemne it, to alter at their pleasure the state of Religion by actes of parliament, without the consent of their cleargie, to depose Bishoppes and put other in their places, in their stiles and titles boldely to write themselues gouernours in their Realmes in al thinges and causes, as wel Ecclesiastical as Temporal: and yet no order al this while broken, because forsoth they be such as they beare them in hand they are, that is to saye, the heades, the rulers, the shepherdes, the fathers, maisters and guides in Religion.*

No well.

\*Railing reproches most vsuall to the Papistes, doo show what they be who do speake thē: not what they be, of whom they are spokco.

Concerning these contumelies of wordes, where with you here and els where continually ouerwhelme vs they doo \*proue nothing against vs, but do declare the malice of your, and felowes hartes, out of the abundance wherof they procede: we thinke it no marueill when the maister of the housholde was called Beelzebub, that we his pooze seruauntes are thus misnamed, and re

and reuiled: nay we take it to sound to our praise, to be conformed to him in this part of reproches, sustained at their hands, who are the very successours and children of the slanderers of our Saviour.

But to the matter, we say, *D.* Dozman here maketh vs to speake as pleaseth him, and where he can not re-  
 proue y<sup>e</sup> whiche we say, he maketh vs to say that whiche  
 he may reprove. For that Princes be heades of <sup>the</sup> Church and not  
 members, that Princes may by no meanes be ruled in causes of Reli-  
 gion, that they by the right of their crowne may approue or condene  
 doctrine, and alter at their pleasure the state of Religion, &c. We  
*D.* Dozmans sayngs and not ours: for if they be ours,  
 let him shewe where & when we haue so said, or writte.  
 Suche kinde of phrascs be proper to y<sup>e</sup> Papistes onely,  
 who doo make so of their Pope, & attribute all this, and  
 much moze to him: it is *D.* Dozmans present proposi-  
 tion now in hand, that the Pope is the head of Christes vniuersal  
 Church here in earth, of whiche office as befoze he hath pro-  
 mised to proue, that no lay man, woman, nor childe, can be capable.  
 (for thus he speaketh) so is he here not ashamed moste  
 vnruly to charge vs, as though we had affirmed, that  
 a prince so might be. But we euer graunted y<sup>e</sup> our Chri-  
 stian princes, though they be the chiefe persons and go-  
 uernours in the particuler Churches of their owne do-  
 minions, be yet both the selues & their particuler churches  
 also, children and members of Christes vniuersall  
 church: wherof as he saith moste vnruly, y<sup>e</sup> their Pope  
 in earth is the head, & no member, so doth he & other his  
 felowes teach, y<sup>e</sup> their said Pope must rule in all causes  
 of Religion, & by no meanes may be ruled, that no man  
 may gaine say his determinations, but are of necessitie  
 bound to obey the without any grudge, inquisition or ex-  
 aminatio at al, y<sup>e</sup> it apperteineth to him in y<sup>e</sup> right of his  
 Romaine

M. Dorman frameth our saynges as pleaseth him.

Dorman supra fol. 15. a.

Christiã Princes childrẽ and members of Christes Church.

Pighius Hierar. lib. 6. cap. 13. Hard. Confur. Apolog. fol. 302. 304.

**a** Hardinge in  
 in his answer to  
 the Bishop of  
 Sarum. Fol. 85.  
**b** Epist. Sixti. 2.  
**c** Pigh. hierarch.  
 lib. 6. cap. 13.  
 De elect. & elec.  
 potestate. cap.  
 Significasti.  
 in glosa.  
 Extra Iohã. 22.  
 cap. Cum inter.  
 in glosa. Et de  
 Maior. & obe.  
 cap. vnam sanct.  
 in glosa.  
**d** Princes sub-  
 iect to error, as  
 well as to other  
 humane infir-  
 mities.  
**e** D. Hard. con-  
 fut. Apol. fo. 298  
 & 299.  
**f** VVe neither  
 goo about to  
 make Princes  
 Popes, nor petie  
 Popes.  
**g** Christiã prin-  
 ces do now take  
 vpo them none  
 other authori-  
 tie, than the an-  
 cient godly prin-  
 ces bothe of the  
 Iuis h and Chri-  
 stiã church yfed.

Romaine chaire, to approue or condemne doctrine, and  
 at his pleasure to alter the state of Religion, that  
 his expositions of the scriptures, <sup>a</sup> for that he can not  
 erre, as in whom <sup>b</sup> S. Peter dwelleth, are most certain,  
 and infallible rules, alwayes to be folowed, that <sup>c</sup> his  
 iudgement is moze to be folowed than the iudgemēt of  
 the whole worlde: that he is moze than a man, & their  
 lord God the Pope: that he hath all authoritie y<sup>d</sup> Christe  
 hath. And thei most falsely thus teaching of their Pope  
 doo as falsely affirme, that we woulde make Popes of  
 our Princes, whom, though they be the chiefe men, yet  
 we euer taught, and so them selues haue euer acknow-  
 ledged, to be but mortal men, subiect to errour <sup>e</sup> as wel  
 as to other humane infirmities: Whereby it may eu-  
 dently appeare howe vnturlic they doo beare the people  
 in hande, that of Princes we would, either make <sup>f</sup> them  
 Popes, by attributing to them the office of the Pope, &  
 as muche authoritie as the Pope claimeth ouer all the  
 Church: or at the least, petie Popes, by geuing them  
 Popishe authoritie ouer the Church within their own  
 dominions. <sup>g</sup> Whiche surmises and sclaunders howe  
 false they be: and that neither we doo attribute to our  
 Princes, neither our Princes doo take vpon them any  
 suche Popishe pzeeminence, either generally ouer the  
 whole Church, or particularly ouer the Church of their  
 owne dominions, <sup>h</sup> but onely the authoritie by the pra-  
 ctise and example of all vertuous and godly Princes,  
 both of the Iuishe, and Christian Church, proued to  
 be due vnto them, shall in this processe moste plainly  
 appeare. For though the vsurped power of the Pope o-  
 uer the Church of England, by common consent of the  
 Prince and estates of the Realme, assembled in parlia-  
 ment,

ment, be remoned: though the Scriptures, prayers and service of God, in our native language to all our countrey men knowen, with certaine other godly thinges, belonginge to diuine seruice, by the saide false vsurper the Pope, and his prelates, befoze vniustly remoued and taken away from the people of God in our countrey, be restozed and established by the same comon authoritie:

Yet is therefore neither any true doctrine condemned, neither any state of Religion, in Goddes and our Saniour Christes worde and Lawe taught, or set forth, altered or chaunged, but rather are all these thinges by the authoritie of Gods worde, stablished and obserued: the same true doctrine, & Christian Religion, the same bookes of the olde Testament and the Newe, that is of the whole Scriptures & lawe of God (wherein the saide true doctrine & Religion are contained) that were from the beginning, are stil retained and kepte, and are now set forth and deliuered to the people of God, yee better, and moze perfects for edification set forth and deliuered, then they were lately befoze: that is to witte, in suche sorte as Goddes people may vnderstande them, both by readinge, and hearing of them, as is most meete that those, that stande bounden to the keepinge of the lawe, shoulde not be ignoraunt what is the Lawe: (as on the contrary parte was befoze moste vnrasonably done by the Papistes, to keepe Goddes people, bounden to keepe Goddes lawes, from the knowledge of the same vnder an vnknown language and tongue.) The same Christian Religion, the same Scriptures, I saie, and worde of God, and no other, are now kepte, retained, & reuerenced, the same faith contained at large in the said Scriptures, and briesly comprised in the thre credes,

No true doctrine, nor good state of Religion altered, muche lesse condemned: but onely a false vsurpar with his gainfull abuses remoued by publike authority.

It is meete that those, who doo stande bounden to keepe the lawe, shoulde knowe the lawe.

The same Christian Religion, scriptures, faith, wherein wee were Baptised, &c.

That were frō  
the beginninge  
are now kepte,  
used, and reue-  
renced.

or summes of our faith, the Apostles crēde, the Nicene  
crēde, and Athanasius crēde: in the whiche faith we  
were baptised, is now professed, pronounced, and redde  
with vnderstanding, & beleued: the same Lawe of God,  
the same cōmaundements of God, to lead our liues by,  
are now set fōrth with vnderstandinge: the same forme  
of the Lordes praier, taught by our Saviour Christ, is  
now dayly used: the holy Sacramentes, of Baptisme, &  
of the Bodie & Bloud of our Saviour, with prayers, &  
other seruices of God, are according to the saide Scrip-  
tures now ministred, receiued, & obserued duely with  
reuerence in our Churches. Nothing therfore of y<sup>e</sup> sub-  
stance of Christian, & true Religion is altered: no doctrine  
y<sup>e</sup> is in the Scriptures & Lawe of God deliuered, taught,  
& allowed, is refused, much lesse (as this man saith) are  
they, at the pleasure of the Prince, either altered or con-  
demned: onely the Romishe vsurper, and at uses by him  
obtruded, and thrust vpon our countrey, prince, & peo-  
ple, are by the authoritie of Gods worde, & by the an-  
cient lawes reuiued, restozed & receiued in the realme,  
out of our said countrey expelled, whereunto if that por-  
tion of the Cleargy, that for their priuate lucre haue cō-  
spired and sworne to the maintenance of the said vsur-  
per their heade, and his abuses, againste their Prince,  
and their countrey, will not agree: as it may be truelie  
saide that such alteratiō, or rather refozmatō, is made  
without the cōsent of some being a portion of y<sup>e</sup> Clear-  
gie, so is it most true, that true Religion, beyng by the  
Pope, & his sworne seruauntes of the Cleargie, at their  
pleasure befoze falsely altered, & corrupted, is with the  
aduise of the godly learned Cleargie, according to Gods  
expresse will & pleasure in his worde declared, by pu-  
blike

What is by pu-  
blike authori-  
ty of Parliamēt  
altered or re-  
moued.

It is no newe  
thing, for the  
Bishoppes to  
withdraw their  
cōsents frō actes  
of Parliamēt,  
and yet the saide  
actes neuerthe-  
lesse stande in  
full force and  
strength. Vide  
Richard. 2. An-  
no. 11. cap. 3.

blisse authoritie of al y other estates of y Realme, truly reformed, & restored. And in case y saide partial swozne Cleargie, will needes still continue for their private lucre, and ambition in their conspiracie, to the mainete-  
 nance of the said vsurper, as their head, though vnna-  
 tural, against our natural Prince, and the Realme, and  
 to the continuance of their saide grosse abuses and er-  
 rours, to the deceiuing of the Christian people, whiche  
 are by God to the government of the Prince committed,  
 should the Prince most manifestly knowyng the same,  
 wittingly, and willingly suffer such a Cleargie, as per-  
 sons by vniuste priuilege exempt from al controlment,  
 still to remayne in authoritie, to the more effectuous se-  
 ductinge of Goddes people, to the Princes chardge com-  
 mitted, and practisinge for a foraigne vsurper, againste  
 the naturall Prince and countrey: so it shoulde be by  
 M. Dormans will: elles is all ordre broken, and all confusion  
 brought in, by his iudgement: elles are the courses of the Sunne  
 and Moone chaunged: elles the foote presumeth to be the head: elles  
 Princes take vppon them in the right of their crowne, to approue or  
 condemne doctrine, to alter at their pleasure the state of Religion:  
 elles doo Princes mengle heauen and earth, holy and prophane things  
 together: elles are Christian Princes guiltie of plaine violence and  
 robbetrie, of sacrilege and Antichristianisme, as inuading by tirany  
 Priestes offices, yea and very Priesthoode it selfe: and we forsoothe  
 more guiltie of beastly, and parasiticall flateringe of the saide  
 Princes, by M. Dormans iudgement and determination.

A Cleargy not  
to be suffered.

M. Dormans,  
not Nazianze-  
nes, order bro-  
ken.

Dor. Post. fol.  
27. a.

Dorman. Fol. 17.

These be they therefore good readers that as the Prophete saith,  
 call bonum malum, & malum bonum, tenebras lu-  
 cem, & lucem tenebras, good euell, and euell good, darckenes  
 light, and light darckenes.

D. Harding ob-  
iecteth the same  
vnto vs in son-  
dry places.  
Cōfur. Apol. fo.  
II. 2. 14. b. 15. a.  
&c.

You haue hitherto shewed no good thinge, that we haue called euill: no darknes, that we haue called light: neither contrarywise. Onely you haue made euell and false reposites of Christian Princes, and vs: and woulde haue the simple people to belæue that your euil sayings are ours. But in dæde who so euer knoweth your sayings and doinges, may well belæue that the Prophete here speaketh directly of you. For touchinge euen that matter of the mariage of Ecclesiasticall ministers, so sclanderously a litle befoze by you reuiled, who so euer heareth the woꝛde of God, teachinge euery man & woman (foz the auoydinge of fornication as a great euill) to marie: and that to marie is better then to burne: and that mariage is not onely good and honest, but also honozable emongst al men without exception, & that God will condemne whozemongers and adulterers; & on the contrary part, seeth or heareth how many poppish Priestes haue continued, & do continue in fornication, adulterie, and other not to be named vncleannesse, rather then they will marie, as though mariage were greater euil then such vncleannesse, who so euer, I say, will consider this, may knowe who they be, that do call god euill, & euill god. And you not content therewith, do with all reproches and vilanie of contumelies, ouerwhelme such of the Cleargie, as hauinge not the gift of leadinge a sole life in true chastitie of minde and bodie, and fearinge Goddes dreadfull threathninges denounced, not onely to suche as liue in whooredome and filthie life, but also to suche as doo burne with vnlawfull desires and lustes, and therefoze fearinge moze Goddes wꝛath, than mans corrupt iudgement

and

and vnjuste sleanders, doo marie, as God dothe in his holy woozde not onely permitte, but in suche case also, doth will and commaunde them, and all men and women to doo.

Againe whosoever considereth how God forbiddeth all Idols, Images, Similitudes, and likenesses of any thing what so euer, whiche are the wozkes of mennes handes, and haue eyes and see not, handes and seele not, feete and goo not, &c. (for by all these names and circumstances, dooth the Scripture terme them, exceptinge none,) to be placed in his temple, or to be wozshipped: calling them not onely euill, but the beginninge and ende of all euill, abhominable, defiling of Goddes holy house, the tentation of mens soules, the snares of simple mens seele: and withall readeth the horrible thzeatninges of God to all suche as doo make, & wozshippe such Idols, Images, Similitudes, or likenesses, doing euill befoze the Lorde, as salety the Scriptures. And on the contrary part hath seene Images, Similitudes and likenesses of men, and women, (whiche no doubt are thinges in heauē aboue, in the earth beneath, or in the water vnder y earth, wozkes of mens handes, hauing eyes and see not, handes and seele not) placed by Popish Priestes in the temple of God, as good things, or ornaments of the Lordes house, and the light of the blynde, and named Idolttes, or late mens bookes: who them selues haue wozshipped them, and caused others to wozship them, with seeking of them by pylgrimage, with kneeling & cреeping to them, with kissinge of their feete, with giftes and oblations, and with perfuminge of incense, as with burnt sacrifice: and haue by the said Images, and suche wozshipping of them robbed Gods

Exod. 20. Non facies. Non coles ea. &c.

Jerem. 32 f. 34  
Posuerunt Idola in domo in qua inuocatum est nomen meū, vt polluerent eam, principes & Sacerdotes & Prophetæ corū, &c.  
Sap. 14 d. 27. &c.

Deut. 4. d. 25  
Si decepti feceritis vobis aliam similitudinem patrum malum coram Dño Deo vestro vt cum ad iracundiam prouocetis, testes inuoco cœli & terrā cito vos pituros esse de terra, &c.  
Ibique seruietis. Dijs q̄ hominibus fabricati sūt ligno & lapidi qui non vident &c.

D 3. people.

people both of all godlines, and of their gould to, and gete to them selues thereby infinite thousandes. And as the Scriptures testifie, that suche Princes as haue pulled downe such Images, haue doone that whiche is good in the sight of the Lorde, and that those Princes whiche set them vp, and worshipped them, haue doone euill in the sight of the Lorde: So doo our Papistes cleane contrary, calling them that set by such Images, garnishe and decke them, honour and woozhip them, good and catholike men, and suche as do pull them downe, or will not worzhip them, they call loulardes and heretiques. Who so euer, I say, will consider these things on both partes, and infinite other like things, in the Popishe Church mozte vsuall, and heareth M. Dozman crye out: *These be they good Readers, that as the Prophet saith, call good euill, and euill good &c.* woulde he not thinke, that he directly pointed out, and describep the Popishe Sinagoge: for it is enough by these two examples, to geue the Reader a taste of al other their like wrong esteeming and misnaming of things. Further whosoever readeth in the holy Scriptures, that the woorde of God is a lanterne, and light to our feete, and steppes: that his commaundement and lawe is clear, lightening the eyes, pure couerting mens soules, geuing wisdom to the litle & simple ones: and findeth that for these causes our sausour Iesus Christ, exhorteth men to searche the Scriptures, showing the ignozance of the Scriptures to be the causes of errors. And on the contrary part doo they heare and see what the Pope and his Prelates say, and doo: howe they teache that the searching and knowledge of the Scriptures, are the causes of errors, & ignozace, the mother of deuotion: how they

Psal. 118. Lucerna  
pedib<sup>9</sup> meis ver-  
bum tuum. &c.  
Præceptū dñi lu-  
cidū illuminans  
oculos. &c.  
Lex Dñi imma-  
culata & cōuer-  
tēs animas. &c.  
Sapiētiā prestā:  
paruulis.  
Prouer. 6. c. 23.  
mādatū lucerna  
est, & lex lux.  
John. 5. f. 39.  
Scrutamini scri-  
pturas.  
Math. 22. c. 29.  
Erratis nescien-  
tes scripturas

hide

hſde the light of Gods wōrd, from the eyes of y ſimple, to whome it ſhould ſhine, vnder the buſhel of a ſtraunge language: how they burne that light of Gods wōrde, ſhining to the ſimple in y brightnes of a knowen tōge, in a light fire: and by al thzeatninges & terrours, feare the people of God, bound to kepe the wil of God, from the reading of the wōrde of God, and from knowing of his lawe, conuerting their ſoules, and vnderſtandinge of his will in his wōrde contelned, as though it did not conuert, but *perueri mens ſoules: not ſuffering them* (vntil now of late time, that y Papistes were ſoz very ſhame ther to compelled) as much as to haue the articles of the *Chriſtian faith*, the tenne cōmaundemēts, & the lordes praſer, in their knowen mother tongue, not to knowe how to beleue, how to lue, how to pray: but cōpelling chriſtians like Pope nlayes, to pronounce wōrdes not vnderſtāded, and ſo by asking they wote not what, to be gilt y ther ſoze befoze the Lord. Againe whoſoever readeth in the ſcriptures, that mē of the Cleargie are called the light of the world, ſoz that they ſhould by preaching of Gods wōrd, y true light, conuert the world frō the darkenes of the ignozaunce of God, to the light of the knowledge of him, & ſaith our popiſh Clergie, not contēted to with draw the light of the ſcriptures from y people, to with draw alſo the light of their preaching, & to become blind guides, & lead the blind into the ditch of ignozaunce & error firſt, & of damnation after ward. And ſo, where as our Sauioz Chriſt ſaith, al y is made manifeſt is light, theſe mē not ſuffering y wōrd of God, neither any thing els to be manifeſt, would kepe al in darkenes, ſhe wing the ſelues to hate the light, as euil doers, fearing their wōrkes of darkenes, by the light to be made manifeſt.

And

*Psalm. 118.*

*Illuminans oculos intellectum dans paruulis.*

*Math. 5. b. 13.*

*Vos estis lux mundi.*

*Luc. 1. Illuminare ije qui in tenebris & c.*

*Act. 26. Ut conuertantur a tenebris ad lucē.*

*Eph. 5. Omne quod manifeſtatur lumen eſt.*

And thus not teaching them selues, neither opening the eyes of the blinde, neither suffering the people to see the light with their owne eyes, they haue set by blinde Images that can see nothing thē selues, (it may seeme in very mockage of y<sup>e</sup> poore blinde people) to geue sight to others, that can see something: and lame Images that can not go one s<sup>te</sup>pe, to leade & guide others, that can go in the waye of life, as they say, for they cal them Late mēs bokes (as I said) that is to say, their teachers and instructors. Whosoer I say wel considereth these thinges, and infinite mo like, and heareth M. Dozman trie, these be they that call light darkenesse, woulde he not thinke I saye, that he appointed moste direaly, and painted out moste liuely, the Popishe Synagoge: And haue we not good occasion, yea, most iust cause, to geue hartie thanks to God, the father of lightes, and to set forth his excellent goodnes, who hath called vs from the power of this Popishe deuillishe darkenes, vnto the maruelous light of his glorious Gospell.

Collof. 1. b. 13.

Gracias agentes Deo qui eripuit nos de potestate tenebrarū. &c.

& 1. Pet. 2. b. 9.

Ve virtutes anticiemus eius qui de tenebris nos vocauit in admirabile lumē suū.

Dorman. Fol. 17.

*These be they that as their idol of Geneva (in this point truly) giueth answer, go about to make princes iustle with God.*

Calui. l. Inst. ca.

Nowell.

Not Caluine, (whome it pleaseth M. Dozman to call our Idoll) but M. Dozman him selfe saith so of vs. For though Caluine was by misreport abused (as shall hereafter plainely appeare) yet in deeds we doo attribute no moze to Christian Princes, than he dooth: neither game he any lesse to them than we doo, as hereafter, where M. Dozman is in hande with Caluine twise  
or thise

so; thise againe, shall manifestly be declared. And it is a false sleaunders, that we go about to make Princes to lustle with God. They be the Papisles, that make the Pope to lustle with God, terming him their Lozde and God the Pope, affirming him to be moze than a man, that he can not erre, aduouching that he hath al power that Christ hath. That his will standeth fo; reason.

These be those clawbackes, and Popishe Parasites, that set their Pope not onely above all the Church, but also auance him against all that is called God, as was befoze fo; showed, that Antichrist should be auanced, and magnified.

*Dorman. Fol. 17.*

Finally, these are those lowlie brokers, that leading as it were by the hand, their good and vertuous Princes, after this sweete poisoned bait, from the most pleasant and fertile valeis of humilitie, to the top of the high barren, and craggy mountaines of pride and arrogancie, holding them when they have them there, the riches and ornamentes of the Church, the landes and reuenues thereof (by good and vertuous Princes their predecessours and auncestours, long time before for this entent especially thereto giuen, that the Ministers of Christes moste holy woorde and blessed sacramentes, beinge by hauing of their owne, deliuered from that comberous care of provision for them selues, that after warde the holy Ghoste who was the procuror of suche almoise, and stirred from time to time, the deuotion of good men thereto, forsaue through the decarie of pietie, and coldenesse of charitie to wardes the latter ende of the worlde, they were likely to fall into: might thereby the more quietly folowe their vocation:) promise of all the same to make them the Lordes and maisters, if they will doo them homage, and fall downe and worship them, that is to saie, harken to their doctrine, submitte them selues thereto, and graunte it within their Realmes and domi-

De elect. & elec.  
potestate. cap.  
Significasti.  
Extra Iohan. 22.  
cap. Cum intra,  
in glosa.  
De Maior. & o-  
bediētia. ca. vñ  
sanct. in glosa.  
Clement. lib. 3.  
tit. 13. ca. Cū sit.  
2. Theſ. 2. b. 4.

*uions, favourable entretinement.*

*Normell*

Seeing it hath pleased *M. Dozman*, to place vs so nere the most honozable persons of our Princes and Soueraignes, as to lead them by the hand, he might, had it so pleased him, so; that time at the least, haue geuen vs an other moze honest title and name, than *Louisebroggers*: so; they should be somewhat moze cleanly, that should be placed so nere so high, and honourable Princes, by any officer in Court, vnlesse it were *M. Dozman*. And concerning the matier: They be not the pleasaunt and fertile vales of humilitie, that *M. Dozman* doth speake of, but the dimme dales, o; rather dennes and dongeons of bondage and slauerie, in the whiche they would keepe all Christian Princes th;all, vnder their Pope and Popishe Cleargie, to be lead by the noses, whiche waye shall please them. Other wise, we haue bene mozte earnest at all times to admonishe Princes of their dutie, and that they should humble the selues befoze the Maiestie of God, with farre moze diligence, than euer were the popishe preachers, I am sure.

Further, all men be not of *M. Dozmanns* minde, but thinke rather that the excessive riches and possessions, specially dominions, principedoms, and kingdoms, giuen to the Cleargie, as poison poured into the Church, haue ben the cause why they haue left the dutie of preaching, and right ministerie of the Sacrametes, and geuen the selues to wo;ldly cares and couetousnes, and to all riotousnes, pride, pompe, lordlines, and mundane vanitie. Whiche horrible abuses of the Popishe Cleargie, prouoking Gods and mans iust indignation, haue beene the causes of such their decay, as *M. Dozman* complaineth  
of and

Venenum infusum in Ecclesia.

of, and not we: who, as it is well knowen, haue not at any time, encouraged Princes to conuerte the gods of the Church to their priuate gaine, but to publique & Godly vse: as erection of scholes, enlarging of the vniuersities, mainteining of learning, foundinge of hospittalles, and releuing of the poore. Wherefoze M. Doorman doth attribute all this to vs vntruly and maliciously. He might iustly haue applted this allusion of the Devils offere, to his Pope, & popish prelates: whom the Deuill hath led from the vale of humilitie of Ecclesiasticall ministers, vnto the craggie toppes of proude popische Rome, and from thence hath shewed them the riches, dominions, pompe, and glorie of this world, which they (forsaking their ministerie) haue solowed, and catched with toothe & nayle. For sure it is, that the Pope receiued not all his worldly pompe, riches, and dominions of our Sautour Christe who refused the like, by the Deuill vnto him offered, denied his kingdome to be of this worlde, and forbade his true disciples the possession of suche riches, and worldly dominions, as the Pope wholly claimeth as his right, and in part hath the same in possession. Wherefoze he might herein more iustly brag to be his Vicar here in earth, who offered to such, as would worships him, all these things: the Vicar of the Deuill, I say, rather than the Vicar of Christe, who offered them to none, forbade them his true disciples. And I maruelle much that M. Doorman confesseth that the popische Cleargie haue had all their liuinges geuen them by the liberalitie of Princes: for he scarcely agreeth herein with other Papistes, who teache that the Pope is the Lord of al the world, & that neither Constantine the great, nor Phocas, nor Rodonsius Plus, nor Basilidis

De Maior. & obediētia, ca. vnā sanctam.

Sext. Decret. li. 3

tit. 9. ca. Periculo

lofo, in glosa,

Pigh. Herarch.

lib. 5. cap. 3.

tildis the Countesse, gaue the Pope any thinge, but re-  
 stozed him part of y<sup>e</sup> whole, which of right was wholly  
 his owne: no doubt, as deliuered him by the Prince of  
 this worlde, who claymeth it as his owne, and made  
 offer thereof to such, as would wooz shippe him. Where-  
 foze M. Dozman might haue doone moze discretely to  
 haue aduouched, that the Popish Cleargie had all their  
 liuelhode of their Lord & God the Pope, whose is the  
 worlde, and all that therein is, as the Deuits heire  
 apparaunt. For by this his sayng, that the riches and re-  
 uenues of the Church, were by Princes geuen to it, he may seeme  
 to haue broken wide open that wyndoe (with the ope-  
 ning whercof, he falsly chargeth vs) vnto Princes, to  
 take againe that, whiche is confessed to haue beere by  
 them geuen: specially, seing the intent and vse, wherco-  
 foze it was geuen, is not performed on the Papistes  
 partes, but the same liberalitie of Princes, is most ille-  
 berally and shamefully by them abused: whiche hath  
 beene the decate of all pietie in the Romishe Cleargie,  
 and is the cause, why men haue iudged it moze mete to  
 take patt from them, rather thā to geue thē moze. Su-  
 rely M. Dozman, your diuinitie matters haue striken  
 the remēbraunce of your Canon lawe out of your head,  
 when you did write after this sozte.

Dorman. Fol. 17.

And that this is true good Readers, that they haue thus sha-  
 mefully abused and deceiued their Princes, and not surmised or ima-  
 gined by me to bring them into hatred, whom God I take to record, I  
 pitie much and hate nothing: I hope by his assistance, who is the giuer  
 of all good thinges, so plainely to proue, that you your selues (shall  
 as she ete see it, and they (if there remaine yet in them any sparckle  
 of grace)

See D. Hard.  
 Confut. Apolo.  
 fol. 37. a.

of grace) shall not be hable to denie it. The whiche that I may the better performe, I shall truly bringe foorth, as it were into the face of the open courte, all suche evidence of importance, as either parte hath to alleage for them selfe: so truly I truste, that the counsell of the other side shall have no cause to complaine, that either I have suppressed and concealed, their necessarie proufes one waie, or obscured their beauty in the bringinge of them foorth on the other.

No well.

You may knowe the disciple of a pittifull Maister, by his very stile. His maister D. Hardinge speaketh thus: Ye are accused of your fathers, of your bretherne, of your mother, who loue you moste tenderly, and with vnspoke-  
fol. 37. a.  
 able griefe of harte bemoane your case. Thus muche D. Hardinge. M. Dormans wordes are: This is not imagined by me to bringe them into hatred, whome God I take to recorde, I pittie muche and hate nothinge. Thus saithe the scholer. And is one egge more like to an other, than are the speeches of the scholer and the maister: And these pittifull men, & voide of all hatred, are of that sorte, who of loue could not onely (as did she in Terence,) shut vs out of the doores of our countrey, but also of pure pittie and tendre loue, would roste as many of vs as they may get, quicke at a stake, as becometh the childe of so tenderly louinge a Stepmother, as is the Romishe Church: but bicause they are not hable nowe so to ouer reache vs, thanks be to God, and our gracious Soueraigne therefore, yet doth as well the maister as the scholer, as all the childe of that mother, that whiche they may, at euery light occasion, thei doe in their booke ouerwhelme vs with all railinges, reproches, and spitefull wordes:

no doubt of the aboundance of their pitifull & charita-  
 ble heart towardes vs. For who may doubt thereof in  
 M. Dozman, seeing he taketh God to recorde therein: yet  
 I would wishe he should remembre that the Lorde will  
 not holde him guiltlesse that taketh his name in vaine.  
 He doeth with as good confidence trust that he will by  
 Goddes helpe goe through with his lies, as he doth with  
 good conscience cal God to recorde of his pitie towardes  
 vs: he may in dedde rather put his trust in the aide of  
 that lyinge spirite mencioned in the booke of Kinges  
 & Chyonicles, whiche hath for this greate while inspi-  
 red the tongues and guided the pennes of suche Wap-  
 stes moste pithely, and effectuouly, to the deceiuinge of  
 suche as do delight in lies. *That he will bringe all euidence*  
*of importauce that both parties haue, into the face of open Courtes,*  
*he will deale so truely that none shall haue cause to complaine, and*  
*proue all thinges so plainely to the eye. You may beleue him*  
*by that experiance you haue already had of him vppon*  
*like promise. For I assure you, you shall finde him no*  
*chaungeling, but shal at the eye see most evidently, that*  
*as he hath begunne in his former treatie, of the necessi-*  
*tie of one head of the Church, wherein are as many*  
*lics as there be lynes, so will he continue constante to*  
*the ende in bringyng forth whole loades of leude lies, &*  
*fonde fables into the open face of the Courte, without*  
*any suppressinge, conceilinge, or obscuringe of them at*  
*al. And hitherto, good Reader, I pray thee remembre that*  
*M. Dozman from the beginninge hath proued nothing,*  
*neither plainely nor darkly, though he haue saide many*  
*thinges very plainely. As that we haue broken all good or-*  
*dre, made the Delphine to plow, the Ox to swimme: the head,*  
*the feete: the feete the head: that we haue eloked vices vnder the*  
*names*

3. Reg. 22.

2. Paral. 18.

Ero spiritus mē-  
 dax in ore oīm  
 prophetarum  
 eius, &c.

names of vertues: that we will haue Princes by no meanes to be ruled in matters of Religion: that we teach that Princes in the right of their Crowne may at their pleasure condemne doctrine, and alter the state of Religion: that we call good euill, and euill good: light darkenes, and darkenes light: that we make Princes to iustle with God: that we make a shewe of the Riches and reuenues of the Church to Princes, promising to make them Lordes thereof, if they will fall downe and woorshippe vs. All this, and muche moze, hath he alreadie saide, in so thozte a space, and adourned his saide saynges with all vile reprochynge of vs. But he hath onely so saide, and of all these saynges, hath he proued nothinge but onely by sayng: whiche euidence, I trust the Courte wil not allowe, as god and lawfull, or of any impoztaunce, specially seeinge I haue proued truely, and at large declared, that all these his saynges, are false fables, lewde lies, and shamefull sleanders: and that the Pope and his Papistes them selves haue accomplished all these disorders, vled these clokings, so vsurped vppon Christes Church, & Christian Princes: so misnamed god and lighte, by the termes of euill and darkenes, so iustled with God, so fallen downe befoze the Deuill, shewynge and offeringe them the Riches of the worlde: so woorshippinge him, and receiuinge his offer. All which thinges, falsely by M. Dorman in worde attributed to vs, I haue declared in daede, to appertaine to the Pope and his Papistes.

Dorman. Folio. 17.

But because an indifferent and vpright iudge, muste alwaies haue an earnest eye to the issue, (whiche is bet weene vs who shoulde governe in ecclesiasticall causes, the prince or the priest) is  
shall:

A REPROVVE OF M.

It shall not be amisse (because to be chiefe gouernour in thinges and causes ecclesiasticall, is nothinge elles but to haue the supreme iurisdiction thereto belonginge) to examine firste, in what pointes that consisteth, that so by conferringe our euidence with the same, whether it agree with euery parte, with none, with some, and with which: we may at the length by good scanninge come to the knowledge of euery mans owne.

Iurisdiction therefore ecclesiasticall, consisteth especially in three pointes: in auctoritie to iudge ouer doctrine which is found and which is other, in the power of the keyes, that is to say, as our sauour him selfe hath expounded it, in loosinge and bindinge, excommuniatinge and absoluinge, in makinge rules and lawes for the gouernement of the Church, and in the ministry of the woorde and the sacramentes.

Ecclesiast  
call iurisd  
ctio vho  
in it con  
teth.  
Math. 18

Nowell.

It appeareth by this euidence, stile, scanninge, and handlinge, of the matter, and specially by that earnestie to the issue, as becometh an vpright Judge, that M. Dozman hath bene brocking or pedlyng in some suites of the law, and wasted some time therein. And that how so euer he hath trifled hitherto, he will now haue (as he saith) an eye to the issue, and fall earnestly to his matter. But where M. Dozman had rather vse the terme of Jurisdiction, than gouernance of the Church, & saith, to be chiefe gouernour is nothinge elles, but to haue supreme Jurisdiction: it seemeth to me that he expoundeth a plaine worde & matter by a darker, and that of some god purpose, yee may be sure. We can well houlde our selves content with the termes or names, of gouernour and gouernance in the Church and causes Ecclesiasticall, as bothe plaine enough, and nearer to that stile, which

which Christian Princes do by right vse. And I do confesse I haue here first learned y<sup>e</sup> the ministry of the Sacramentes, & preaching of y<sup>e</sup> woꝛde of God, is called Jurisdiction: bylike what so euer pertaineth to any mans office oz duetie, is with *M. Dozman* his Jurisdiction: as feeding of y<sup>e</sup> sheepe, is the Jurisdiction of the sheapherde. Againe me thinke y<sup>e</sup> here be moe pointes of Jurisdiction than thre, elles hath either *M. Dozman*, oz his printer, pointed amisse: excepte, *makinge of rules, and lawes, for the gouernment of the Church, & the ministerie of the woerde and sacramentes*, be altogether but one parte, soz so it is pointed, & yet one woulde thinke them diuers pointes: elles he meaneth, *y<sup>e</sup> the making of rules for the gouernmēt of the Church*, is a parte of binding and loosinge, though it be not so pointed. And so he hath enlarged y<sup>e</sup> parte, to moze than retaining oz remitting of sinnes, as our Saviour him selfe expounded it. But I thinke it of nature nextest to that pointe, which it standeth furthest fro: I meane the first, *of authoritie to iudge ouer doctrine*, wel, it is so placed, that it may be a parte of whiche pointe ye will, oz elles it maketh no matier, whether it be any pointe oz parte at all, oz no: soz though it haue an incertaine place here in *M. Dozmanns* diuision, yet in the processe of his treatie folowing, it hath no place at al, but is passed ouer with great silence, no mention at all beyng made thereof. An other mater there is in this distribution, that if all Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction do stande in these pointes, than al that haue al these pointes, are the heades of the Church: but all Bishoppes haue full authoritie in all these pointes, (as shall in the sequele appeare,) it will fall out therefore, that there be so many heades 'n the Church, as there be Bishoppes. And so *M. Dozman* shall not hereby gaine so muche, soz the Jurisdiction of

Bishoppes, as Ecclesiastical persons, against Christian  
 Princes, as Lay persons; but he shall lose a great deale  
 more of his one onely head, so necessary in the whole  
 church (as he saith) which is his first & chiefe fundatiō of  
 all. And so is it to be feared, lest *D. Doorman*, whilest in  
 this his seconde proposition, he, too inconsiderately traui-  
 leth against Christian princes, do, by too blunt violence,  
 overthrow his first proposition of the necessitie of one head: &  
 so wrestling with Princes vnwares, cast him self in his  
 throwe, & therewith ouerturne y<sup>e</sup> Pope his head. And I  
 pray the, good Reader, consider of al y<sup>e</sup> *D. Doorman* shall  
 bring into y<sup>e</sup> face of open Court (as he saith) in this trea-  
 tie of Jurisdiction ecclesiastical, what one thing there is,  
 y<sup>e</sup> may serue to proue his proposition. *That the head of Chri-  
 stes Church must needs be a Priest.* What one thinge there is  
 whiche appertaineth not as well to all Bishoppes, as  
 to the Bishoppe of Rome. And so consequently maketh  
 all Bishoppes equall with him, which if it fall out, *D.*  
*Doorman* had not so good an eye to his issue, as he saith  
 he would haue. But where as *D. Doorman* hath here  
 made vs a very darke diuision of Jurisdiction ecclesiasti-  
 call, hauinge as he saith the three pointes, but as it appea-  
 reth, one more is crept in vnwares, and so where three  
 onely are appointed, there are founde foure fourth com-  
 ming, two of the which three, or rather three of y<sup>e</sup> which  
 foure, he by and by after saith he wil not trauaile in, but  
 will let them alone, for that there is in them no contro-  
 uersie, whereas in dede the most controuersie is in one  
 of them. I meane, about the authoritie in makinge rules, and  
 lawes for the gouernement of the Church. Whiche pointes  
 yet with the other two pointes of the power of the keyes  
 and ministry of the woordes and sacramentes, *D. Doorman* in y<sup>e</sup>  
 procelle passeth ouer in great silence, and so he leaueth  
 to

to vs behinde, as remaininge in controuersie, onely the first pointe of his Jurisdiction, whiche is: *the authoritie to iudge ouer doctrine, whiche is founde and whiche is not*. But whereas knowledge in Goddes woꝛde, is most requisite in iudgeing of doctrine in matters of Religio, without the which, there is sure no authoritie to iudge therein, (foꝛ blinde men can iudge no colours.) I doe maruaile that M. Dozman maketh no mention of knowledge in iudgeing of doctrine, but onely of *authoritie to iudge ouer doctrine*. Woulde he at the firste, beare vs in hande, that a Bishop, as blinde as a betell, as ouer many are to be founde euen nere to the Pope, and hauinge not muche moze learninge almost than some asse, should onely by his authoritie iudge of the doctrine of a learned man, beyng no Bishop? Surely great learned men of your side M. Dozman, doe affirme that in thinges concerning faith, the saying of a meane man, is to be preferred before the sayinge of the Pope, if he bzing better reasons out of the Newe and Olde Testament, than doeth the Pope: whereby it seemeth they doe not geue all to authoritie without knowledge, or truethe. And if you doe meane authoritie with knowledge to iudge, I woulde you had spoken moze plainely. But foꝛ that your diuision is very obscure, in the whiche me thinke I doe see foure pointes, where you make but thre, and foꝛ that you doe geue ouer by and by two of the thre, or rather thre of your foure, as beinge in no controuersie, where in dede one of them is moste in controuersie: and foꝛ that the onely firste pointe remainyng, whereuppon you doe bende your whole intent, is very darke, and doubtfully pointed, I can not here solow the pointes of your diuision, foꝛ that in dede I doe not like them. But seeinge you haue chosen this place, wherein

Gerfon.  
Panormitanus.  
De electione, ca.  
Significasti. In  
cōcernentib⁹ si-  
cō, etiam dictū  
vnius priuati  
esset preferēdū  
dicto Papæ, si il-  
le moueretur  
meliorib⁹ ratio-  
nib⁹ noui & ve-  
teris Testamētis,  
q̄ Papa.

to make your diuision of the whole, and haue here such an earnest and narrowe eye to the issue, I will here also, though not so lawlike and finely, as you haue done, yet moze trulie, and as plainely, as I can declare.

1 First, how y<sup>e</sup> Church of God vniuersally is gouerned.

2 Next, how clearly, we deuide the office of Bishoppes, from the office of Christian Princes, as distinct & diuers offices, & by no meanes to be confounded and mingled.

3 Thirdly and laste, what matters and causes ecclesiasticall they be, wherein we do attribute and geue the chiefe authoritie to Christian Princes, and what manner of authoritie it is, that we do geue to them in the saide causes, and ouer persons Ecclesiasticall.

4 First we teache, that Christ the onely head & gouernour of his whole Church thzoughout all y<sup>e</sup> world, hath comitted & appointed y<sup>e</sup> charge of particuler churches, parcelles of the saide whole Church, to certaine officers & gouernours vnder him here in earth, by th<sup>e</sup> according to his holy worde, as by an expresse lawe, to be ruled & gouerned, as most ma<sup>t</sup>e is y<sup>e</sup> Christes Church shoulde be by Christes lawe gouerned. Moreouer concerning the same lawe or worde of God, & of our Saviour Christe, we teach, that it is immutable & vnchaungeable (as becometh the lawe of God to be) & that neither Prince, nor Priest, nor any other man, nor al men together haue any authoritie to alter or chaunge any doctrine or pointe of Religion, deliuered & appointed in that lawe by our Saviour Christ to be kepte & obserued, thzoughout his whole Church, & in euery parcell of the same: but that all persons within the said church & churches, Princes, Priestes, & al other potentates without exceptio<sup>n</sup>, of degree, estate, or vocation, do stande bounden to the obedience of the same lawe and worde of God: and ought to  
 euery

every one in their vocation to maintein, none other but that onely Religion and doctrine, whiche is in the sayd Lawe by our Saviour Chzist deliuered, & for ever established. Wherfoze the fallnes of these sleauderous sayings of M. Dozman, affirming a litle befoze, that we should teache, *that Princes may in the right of their crowne at their pleasure approue or condemne doctrine, and alter the state of Religion, &c.* dooth hereby moste evidently appeare.

Dorm, fol. 16. b.

2. Secondly, we expressely deuide the offices of Chzistia and godly Princes, from the offices of Bishoppes, and other ministers of the Church vnder them, as distinct and diuers offices. And we doe teache that the offices of preaching of Gods woorde, of the pronouncing of publique praier in the Church of Chzist, the power of the keyes, or of binding and loosinge, and of ministring the holy Sacramentes, are by the woorde of God appointed, to be the peculiar offices of Bishoppes, and of other Ecclesiasticall ministers: the whiche offices the saide Bishoppes & other ministers, as the ministers of God and his Church, must execute and fulfill, accordinge as they are taught, and commaunded by the said lawe, and woorde of God, and our Saviour Chzist, and no otherwyle: whiche to the ende they may doo the better, they are bounden to be moste studious of the sayde Lawe and woorde. And we teache and preache, even in presence of Princes, that neither Princes, noz any other persons, sauing onely Bishoppes and other Ecclesiasticall ministers vnder them, may entermidle with the said offices and ministeries Ecclesiasticall, so peculiarly and onely apperteining to the saide Bishoppes, and other ministers of the Church. And thus we clearly remitte vnto M. Dozman twoo of the thre poinces of

his iurisdiction Ecclesiasticall: that is to say, *the power of the keyes, and the ministerie of the woorde and sacramentes, as to which, Christian Princes doe not, nor ought not to make any manner of title or claime, to be the ministers therof. Yea in the execution of these things, we doe graunte, that Princes must geue place to Bishoppes, as to their superiours in their owne peculiar and particular offices, wherein Princes haue nothing to doe: or to speake moze properly, the Princes must geue place to Gods woorde ministered by the Bishops, and other ministers Ecclesiasticall, and ought as well as other meane men, to submitte them selues, and humble to heare the word of God by them preached, reuerently to receiue at their handes the holy Sacramentes, by them duely, according to the same woorde of God, ministered, and deliuered: patiently to heare their vices by them with the same woorde of God, and by the authoritie thereof rebuked: & if they doe deserue by contempt against the same, to be also excommunicated, quietly to suffer the same, without all force and violence: All superiortie in the whiche things is properly appertaininge to Christe, whose woorde is herein obeyed, whose holy Sacramentes are herein ministered, and whose Church is hereby gouerned. Ministerie is the Bishops and Priestes, who are thereof also called ministers of Christes Church: which the aduersaries them selues can not denie, wherefore they all being in deede ministers of the Church, one of them doth vse great presumption to claime to be the head of all the Church. Hitherto good Reader, thou maist see that we neither force the Oxe to labour in the Sea, nor the Delphine to plowe the lande, neither goo about to chaunge the course of the Sonne or Moone, neither make the feete the head, nor the head*

Hofius. lib. 2.

fol. 71. 72.

Sacerdos vel  
Christi capitis,  
vel Christi cor-  
poris minister.

Dor. fol. 15. b. 16.

b. & 27. a. 27. b.

the head the feete, neither teache that Princes may by no meanes be ruled in matters of Religion, nor that they may alter at their pleasure the state of Religion, as rulers and maisters in Religion: Neither doo we mingle heauen and earth, holy and prophane thinges together, as **M. Dozman** laleth to our charge: neither doo we confounde the office of Spirituall governours and Temporal Magistrates. Neither doo we appointe the supream pastorship of the Church to a Lay Magistrate. Neither woulde our presumptuous heades, that Princes should take vpon them the office of Bishoppes, and of the Pope him selfe. Neither doo we animate them so to doo: Neither make we the office of a Bishop so indifferent and commune, that whan Bishoppes be negligent, Temporall men may doo their steede, as **Doctoꝝ Hardinge** chargeth vs, but we doo leaue to the Bishops and Priestes of Christes church, their peculiar office whollie, and vntouched of Prince, or other persone. And withall thou maest well vnderstande, good Reader, that manie of **M. Dozmanns** reasons and allegattons in this his processe, prouinge nothing els but that priestes may execute and doo these offices, and ministeries Ecclesiasticall, & that Princes may not doo them, nor intermedle with the peculiar offices of Bishoppes, are superfluous, and might well be spared. For we doe graunt, and euer haue graunted the same. For whan we doe speake of causes Ecclesiasticall, wherin Christian princes are the chief governours, we meane not y<sup>e</sup> Princes should execute these peculiar offices of priestes, as is also in the **Quenes Maiesties** instructions, in a plaine admonition to the simple men, that might be other wise deceiued by the malicious, notified to al the subiectes of the Realme, that will be disposed to vnderstande the truthe without caullation.

D.Hard. Cōfut.  
Apol.fol.7.&  
298..a.b.

D.Hard. ibidē.  
299.a.

3 But nowe to come to the third parte, touching the  
authoꝝ

authoritie of Princes, to ouersee that the Bishops and Cleargie, doe these their offices, so peculiarly by Gods woorde to them appointed, diligently and truely, according to the rule of Gods woord, to commaunde them to doe their dutie, to admonish the being therein slack, to reprehend the offending, depose or depriue them, being incorrigible: yea, and to punish the al others that wil in any wyse impeache Bishoppes, or other Ecclesiasticall ministers in their offices. This, we say, is the office of a chiefe gouernour ouer the said persons Ecclesiasticall, which doth apperteyne to Christian Princes, euery one in their owne dominions: as by the examples of al godly auncient Princes, as well of the olde Lawe, as of Christian Religion, shall hereafter mooste plainly appere. And so for that priestes may by Gods worde reprove the errors, vices, and euill manners of Princes, and may excommunicate Christian Princes, (as S. Ambrose excommunicated Theodosius) but they may go no further with any violence: and Christian Princes, may not onely admonish and blame Priestes, for their euill corrupt maners, or for not doing their offices due-ly, but may also with the aduise of the godly learned, specially being of the Cleargie, punish, depose, and depriue Priestes that are manifest offendours. We doe truly say that Christian Princes are herein, and in this sorte, chiefe gouernours ouer persons Ecclesiasticall.

Further, besides the office of preaching and ministering the Sacramentes, whiche are befoze named, as apperteyning peculterly to priestes: there ar also many other orders, matters, and causes Ecclesiasticall, touching Ceremonies, and the outwarde Regiment of the Church, (which may be termed the Ecclesiasticall pol-  
licie)

Use) whiche is not throughout all the whole Church, in all pointes of one sort (as are those immutable Lawes of the onely head therof, Christ) but are in diuerse particular Churches of diuers sortes, and that without any inconuenience at all, so they all agree in those vnbchangeable Lawes, geuen by the vniuersal head, Christ.

This is to be seene in Sozom. Hist. Eccl. lib. 7. cap. 19. And in sondrie other places of the Eccl. histories.

There is also the authoritie to receiue appellatiōs, and to heare, and finally to determine controuersies, rising amongst persones Ecclesiasticall, the authoritie to somnone and call Bishoppes and other Ecclesiasticall persons, as men exercised in the studie of the Scriptures, to Synodes, conuocations, and councelles, in necessary cases, as in controuersies risinge about the sense of the Scriptures, and other contentious matters or causes of weight, to order, gouerne, and protecte the sayd Bishoppes and Cleargie, being so called together, and to approue and authorize thinges for the outwarde order Ecclesiasticall, and policie determined in suche Synodes and councels. These be those causes Ecclesiasticall that we doe speake of, whiche doe not pertaine to Bishoppes and Priestes onely. In these cases and causes Ecclesiasticall, the authoritie of a Christian prince is not onely not excluded from intermedlinge with the Bishops and Cleargie, but the Princes authoritie, is the chiefe therein: whiche authoritie the Christian Prince exercising, doth not intermedle with any office belonging to Bishoppes or Priestes only (as the aduersaries of the truth, doe falsely beare men in hande) but with their owne offices, by the examples and practise of all auncient godly Princes, as well in the olde Lawe, as in Christian Religion, proued of right to them to appertaine, as shall hereafter be plainly declared: and to

our Princes also, by the ancient Lawes and statutes of the Realme, (as to the learned in the saide lawes is not vnknowe) of right appertaining. And where Christian Princes are not only in, and of the Church, but also (as I haue saide) the chiefe and praeminent in the Church within their owne dominions: these men doe great wrong to Christian Princes euery where so speaking of the Church, that they make simple men to thinke only Priestes to be of the Church. And to mainteine that opinion, they call Christian Princes mere lay, and mere Tempozal Princes: as though they were no better than Pagaine princes, neither might they any moze medle in matiers, or with persons ecclesiasticall (whom they call Spiritual) thā may Ethnike & Pagane Princes. And it is an vntreue and absurde distinction to name onely Bishops & priestes Spiritual, & Christian princes tempozal persons, and thereby to sequestre the as mere tempozal, from matiers & persons Ecclesiasticall, & Spiritual, as doth D. Hard. by these very wordes. *The duitie of a Christian Prince (whom he calleth a ciuill, & tempozall meere & tempozal, and meere lay Prince) consisteth in ciuill or tempozall matiers, and serueth to the praeseruatiō of mens persons, or bodies. The duitie of Bishops consisteth in spiriual things, and serueth to the praeseruatiō of their soules. These be his wordes. But Bishops doe sometime intermedle in things not very spiriual, as whoredomes, adulteries, sclaunders, subtractiones of tithes, cases testamentarie, &c. whiche in deede are no moze spiriual, thā are murders, theftes, oppressiōs, & other iniuries: & the Prince restraining his people frō these mischiefes, helpeth therein as much to the praeseruatiō of mens soules, as doe the Bishops restraining them from the other mischiefes serue to the said praeseruatiō*

D. Hard. Cōfut.  
Apol. fol. 312. a.  
298. b. 299. a

D. Hard. Cōfut.  
Apolo. fo. 299. a.

nation of their soules. Wherfoze they obserue not their distinction, neither of persons, noz of things Tempozal & Spiritual, noz of the preservation of bodie & soules, so precisely, as thei would haue it seeme: & they are in déede moze careful to kepe Princes from these and such other their Spiritualities, than curious to abstaine the selues from most grosse & carnal Tempozalities. But in déede Christian Princes haue not onely as Princes, to doe with Ciuil or Tempozal matiers, & persons, & with the care of publique honestie, wealth, & peace, and preserving of mens bodie, but also as Christiã Princes, they haue to doe (as befoze is expessed) with Spiritual & Ecclesiastical matiers & persons, & with the care of pietie and godlines, & preserving of the soules of men, to their charge committed, soz a good heathen Prince may do, & vsually doth, as much as D. Harding speaketh of. But the Christian Prince is not onely a Prince, as is y<sup>e</sup> Pagan prince, but also the tutour, the foster father, or mother of the church of Christ, wherof cõmonly y<sup>e</sup> Pagan Prince (though other wise such a good ciuil prince as D. Hard. describeth) is an enemy & persecutour. Wherfoze where D. Harding saith, *that the office of a Priest and a Prince be so muche distincted, as the state of the Church differeth from a prophane common wealth: though I doe graunt their peculiar offices to be so distincte, that neither of them may medle directly with the executing & doing of others offices (soz neither may y<sup>e</sup> Prince minister y<sup>e</sup> Sacraments, noz preache, noz vse the power of the keyes, whiche is y<sup>e</sup> peculiar office of a priest, neither may y<sup>e</sup> priest vse ciuil rule & dominion, which is the office of the Prince) and yet may both y<sup>e</sup> priest admonish the Prince, how to vse his dominion, and reprehend him by Gods woorde, soz not doinge his Princely office rightlie: And a good*

Esay. 49.

D. Hard. Cõfut.  
Apol. fo. 301. b.

Christian Prince, both must, and will, heare and obeye the same. And the Christian Prince may likewise both admonithe and reprehende, yea, with the aduise of the godly learned, specially of the Cleargie, remove and depriue the priest for neglecting wilfully his office, & not doing it according to Gods word: and the priest in that case ought not to disobey the same. And so as it is true, that neither of them may medle directly with the doing of the others offices (for that they are distincte offices:) So is it also as true, that either of them hath an intermingled authoritie ouer the other in the doinge of their offices. Though we do graunt it to be true, that D. Harding saith: that the office of Bishops is not a thing so indifferēt, and so cōmune, that when Bishops be negligent, Temporal mē may do their steed: yet may a godly Prince not withstandinge, when Bishops be euidently negligent, either by calling vpon them, make them diligent: or if they will needes wilfully be stil negligent, may see other, that will be diligent, placed in their rowmes. And where as there can be no greater lacke, or necessitie in Christes Church, than is in y negligence, ignoraūce, or malice of priestes and Bishops, in not doing, or wrong doing of their offices, I doe much marueil at these men, who in cases of necessitie are cōtent to suffer a womā, a midwife, to minister the Sacrament of Baptisme, which is y peculiar office of priestes, can speake after this sorte. Although Bishops had but a title and the name of Bishops, by changing a garment only, as you say: yet that defect in the should not geue habilitie, to the meere lay, as to kings and Quenes to do the office of Bishops. These be D. Hardinges wordes. Now surely whā Bishops shall haue no point of Bishops, but y only name and garment, the defecte and necessitie is as great,

and

Gladius gladiū  
in uare debet.

D. Hard. Cōfut.  
Apol. fol. 299.

D. Hard. Cōfut.  
Apol. fo. 299. b.

and greater in Christes Church, than is the defecte of a Priest in the Christening of a sickely childe: wherefoze I wondze muche that these men, who in the one defecte and necessitie, admitte a womā to do the peculier office, and duetie of Priestes, or Bischoppes, in as greate and greater defectes, and cases of necessitie, will not suffer man, noz woman, Kinge noz Quene, (I say not, to do the peculier offices of Priestes or Bischops, as do their Widwiues) but not as muche as to prouide for suche as will and may do their office, when they can not, or will not do it rightly them selves, from the whiche most necessarie prouision in suche defectes, they woulde scare godly Princes, by bearinge them falsely in hande, that to make such prouision, is the onely office of Bischops, who be the onely cause of suche defectes: in which case of necessitie, no doubt but a Christian Prince may, and ought to prouide for conuenient remedie. Wherefoze, D. Harding so binding the office of a Prince to the state of a pꝛophane commune wealth onely, saith wronge therein: for a Christian pꝛince hath also to do with the state of Christes Church, and to ouersee that Priestes do their offices accoꝛdinge to Goddes worde: (as if shall plainely appeare, that auncient godly Princes of all ages haue done) as the Priest againe (though he vse not ciuill dominion,) yet may he teache the Prince how the ciuill dominion should, accoꝛding to Goddes worde, be well bled. For in dede the Priestes ought to haue more knowledge in Goddes Law (as beinge their onely studie) than the Prince, or any other Lay man. And the Prince ought to heare and obey Goddes worde by the Priest truly preached, and taught: yea and if you shall, obey the Priest also. Obey I say, the Priest, as ex-

equallinge his peculiar office, and as the wiser, & better learned in Gods worde. As the good Prince in narrow and doubtfull pointes of the lawe, will likewise heare the aduise, and follow the iudgement of his Judges, not onely in controuersies betwæne subiect & subiect, but also betwæne him selfe & his subiect, as the aduise of wiser and better learned, not as his superiours, though they geue iudgement with the subiect against the Prince. If men will needes haue any superiouritie aboue h<sup>e</sup> Princes in these pointes, I say, in the one the worde & lawe of God is the superiour: in the other the lawe of h<sup>e</sup> Realme or of the countrey, as made not onely by the Prince, & his authoritie, but also by the whole authoritie and consent of his whole Realme. Yet as the minister of the ciuill lawe pronouncing against the Prince according to the law, ceaseth not to be a subiect: euen so the minister of Gods lawe pronouncing according to h<sup>e</sup> same though againste the Prince, remaineth still a subiecte to the Prince. For as I saide bothe the lawes are the Princes superiours, wherunto he standeth bounde to obey, though not a like superiours. For the positive Lawes of the Realme, as mans lawes, by whome they are made, may by the same authoritie and consent, whereby they were made, be altered, repealed, or suspended for a time or place: but Gods law is alwayes aboue all men, hauinge the originall beginning from God, and therefore by no meanes alterable. And as the Judges being ministers of the lawes of the Realme, can not doe, or determine any thinge to binde the Prince against the lawes of the Realme, whiles they stande in strength: much moze, cā not Protestes the ministers of Gods law, determine any thinge against it, euer standing in strength, and by the Prince,

Verbū Domini  
manet in æter-  
num.

Prince, & all men to be obeyed: And as a wise Prince, is not bounden to follow the counsel of an vndiscreete counsellour, noz the vnlawfull advise of an vblearned oz vnrighteous Judge, be his office, and title neuer so great: so is not a learned, and godly Prince bounden to obey the false doctrine of an vblearned oz wicked Priest, be he neuer so high a Bishoppe. And as a Prince beinge not of him selfe sufficiently learned in the lawes of his Realme to determine againste any Judge, that shalbe accused of erroneous iudgement, may and ought to vse the advise of other Judges, and persons learned in the lawes of the Realme for the triall of the matier, the reuerfinge of the Judgement, & punishinge of the Judge, if the crime were wilfull: so may the Christian Prince beyng not sufficiently of him selfe learned in Goddes worde and lawe to discern the faultes of Bishoppes, in neglectinge wilfully the doinge of their dueties, in preachynge and teachinge of heresies, oz in mainteyninge controuersies amongest them selves, to the disturbance of the Church, vse the advise of others, specially of the Cleargie, therefore by ordze appointed, as learned in Goddes worde, for decidinge of suche causes, and may with the saide advise, correct, punish, oz depose the saide Bishoppes, as iuste cause shall manifestly appeare. And so may the Prince in causes both Ciuill, and Ecclesiasticall, haue either his learned Councell with him, oz his learned delegates for him. I knowe they will obiecte, that a Princes superiortie ouer his Judges, and ouer Priests is not like: for that a Prince maye him selfe exequute the office of a Judge, but not of a Priest. But the question is not whether a Prince may be a Priest, but whether he

be

be the Priestes superiour in causes Ecclesiasticall: A  
 Prince in that he is a Prince and soueraigne, can not be  
 a subiect neither: and yet is he the subiectes superiour.  
 Neither may he certainly exequute the office of a Iudge  
 in his owne person, in all cases: & yet is he the Iudges  
 superiour alwaies. And I haue clearely declared and  
 confessed diuers times befoze, that a Prince may not ex-  
 equute a Priestes office, and I shall hereafter haue oc-  
 casion to repeate the same againe. Wherefoze it is e-  
 uident, that I do not goe about to make them like in  
 that pointe: but in the pointes whiche are to the pur-  
 pose, of prouinge the Christian Prince to be superiour  
 to Priestes, they are like, that is to say: As the Prince  
 in that he is the chiefe, ought to see to the governaunce  
 of all the inferiours in the comon wealth, so ought he  
 as a Christian Prince to see to the good governaunce of  
 the Christian Church. And as he doth solowe the ad-  
 uise of Councillers in the governinge of the common  
 wealth, or of Iudges in euill controuersies, and is not  
 therefoze inferiour to his councillers, or Iudges, so vs-  
 seth he the Priestes learned and godly aduise, in Eccle-  
 siasticall causes, and is not therefoze inferiour to the  
 Priest, in the said causes. For authoritie and know-  
 ledge do not alwaies ioyne, and as a Prince may vse  
 the aduise of suche, as are well learned in the lawes of  
 the Realme, though they be inferiours in office, against  
 the highest Iudges of the Realme, misusing them selves  
 in their offices againste the Lawes: so may the Prince  
 vse the aduise of men learned in Goddes lawes, special-  
 ly of the Cleargie, though otherwise inferiours, against  
 the greatest Priestes and Bishoppes of his Realme,  
 misusing them selves against Goddes lawes. And as a  
 Prince

Prince may by his law remoue vnskillfull or euill iudges,  
 offendinge in their Judgementes against the lawes of  
 the Realme, and in such default of the said Judges, may  
 with the aduise of others honest, and well learned in  
 the lawes, see Justice in ciuill matters to his subiectes  
 to be ministred, by other good officers: so may also a  
 Christian Prince depose ignozaunt or euill Bishoppes  
 or Priestes, offendinge against the lawes of God, and  
 in suche default of the saide Bishops and Priestes, may  
 with the god aduise and helpe of the godly learned, spe-  
 cially of the Cleargie, see the trueth to be taught, & the  
 Sacramentes duely administred in Goddes Church, by  
 other good ministers Ecclesiasticall. And herein I say,  
 the similitude or coparison of the authozitie of a Prince  
 ouer Judges, and other officers in the common wealth,  
 and of his authozitie ouer Bishops, and other ministers  
 of the Church in causes Ecclesiasticall standeth by right.  
 Now whereas the questio is about the correcting or de-  
 posing of an ignozant or euill priest, not doing his office  
 (which a Christian prince may, & ought to do) it is im-  
 pertinent to alleage, that a Prince may not erequite a prie-  
 stes office: which is alwaies graunted that in dede he may  
 not do. Neither hath it been cotrarily pronounced by any  
 discrete person at any time. Whereby the good reader,  
 may well vnderstande how impertinent this treatise of  
 Dormans is: wherin for the most parte he alleageth  
 such places of Scriptures, or auncient Doctours, as do  
 teach nothinge, but that Priestes may preache, vse the  
 power of the keyes, and ministre the Sacramentes, and  
 that Princes may not do priestes offices: which things  
 are not denied, neither is there in them any controuer-  
 sie at all: wherfore in the prouinge hereof, he doth no-  
 thinge

all the worlde with them into a deade sleepe.

Stanislaus Orichonius in Chymæra sua. fol. 97. Rex per hominē fit, sacerdos autē, ex ipso nascitur ex ipso Deo.

Tantūque hic præstat Regi, quantū erectus homo præstat animanti ad partū abiectæ. &c. **Ibidem.**

Quantum Deus præstat sacerdoti, tantū sacerdos præstat Regi.

**Ibidem.** 99. b. Qui Regem anteponebat sacerdoti, is anteponebat creaturam creatori.

**Ibidem** fol. 70. b. Cuius amplitudinem quasi in altera libræ lance, si appendas, non solum hos Reges terræ, sed terras mihi crede, ea lanx, & maria deprimat necesse est. tantū pondus, &c.

And the better to frame Christian Princes to this absolute obedience vnto Priests: some of them write not now to say: That a King is made by man, the Priest is next borne of God, and that the Priest so farre excelleth the Kinge, howe farre man, who goeth vpright, excelleth a brute beast: sleeping grouelinge to his pastour or feedinge, &c. And againe: **v** As much as God excelleth the Priest, so much doth the Priest excel the King, &c. And againe: **c** whosoever preferreth a King before a Priest, he preferreth the creature before the Creator. Neither contented to say as the Popes them selves do: that the Pope doth as farre excell the Emperour, as the sunne excelleth the Moone: he falleth to waying in balauce of **v** Pope, with Peters authoritie (which is euer presupposed he hath) and doubteth not to say, **v** if the Popes amples were put as it were in the one scale of the balance, and these Kinges of the earth, with the earth it selfe, and the seas, in the other, his amples yet, must of necessity ouer way them al: such a force and such a weight, is there in the prince Peter: and how should he than submitte his power to these earthly Kinges?

Thus farre are Stanislaus Orichonius, one of Cardinall Stanislaus Hosius Disciples wordes, truely translate. And will it nowe grieue any Christian Prince humbly to submitte him selfe to the Priest, beinge so farre aboue him, as he is aboue a beast: so farre aboue the Prince as is God aboue the Priest? (A blasphemie intollerable) and this for euery Priest, farre passinge the accustomed extolling of the Pope him selfe, as so muche more excellent than the Prince, as is the Sunne greater and brighter than the Moone. But nowe the Pope is become not in these qualittes onely so farre excellent aboue Princes: but if you will trie the matier by heauines and weight also, as well as

by

by fashion, he is heavier than all the kings of the earth, with the earth it selfe, and the Seas adjoynd.

Merciful God, what would these men not say or do in the blind times passed, that are not ashamed to write thus now in our daies, in the which God hath revealed these Balamites, and that Babilonick beast their head? And so; that we beinge moved with these, and suche like indignities, do as becommeth true Christians, speake against their falshood, and admonish Christian Princes according to the dutie of true subiectes, of their right and due authoritie, against suche false usurpers over the said Christian Princes, (without nevertheles any blemishing of the special authoritie of the true minister of the Gospel) they do therfore name vs Schismatiques, and Horetiques, Fire brandes of hell, Hell houndes, and a thousande such: and not contented therewith, they do persecute vs to the death moste cruelly. And suche Christian Princes, as do geue credit to the truth, and acknowledge their due authoritie, with reverence to God, and his ministers, and do defende vs their true subiectes, from the raging furie of those ravening Romish wolues, vnder their tutele & protectiō, they do charge with plaine violence, and robbery, with sacrilege and Antichristianisme, as inuading by Spannie priestes peculiar offices, and priesthōd it self, and mingling heauen and earth, holy and prophane things together: but false scounders, and true pzooses, be diuers things.

Thus good Reader, thou maest see the difference betwene vs, and where the controuersie standeth. The I say, that in causes Ecclesiastical befoze rehearsed, priests onely haue to do, and that Christian Princes haue nothing;

thing to do therein; otherwise than it shall please the  
 Princes to appointe and authorize them. We say, that  
 Christian Princes haue of their owne right, the chiefe  
 authoritie and governmēt, as wel in the said causes, as  
 ouer the Princes the selues. If M. Dozman haue in this  
 proceſſe any thing sounding for the onely authoritie of  
 Princes, against this chiefe gouernement of Christian  
 Princes, in these causes, and ouer persons Ecclesiasti-  
 call, it is to be answered, as being against vs: the rest,  
 as vayne allegations, against those, who do attribute  
 to Princes the offices of Bishoppes, that is to saye, a-  
 gainst no man, surely not against vs, and vayne profes,  
 that the Clergie hath authoritie, to preache and ex-  
 pounde the Scriptures, to binde, and loose, and to mini-  
 ster the Sacramentes, (which no man denieth) as vaine  
 stuffing of M. Dozmanns booke, may without any his  
 losse, or our gaine, sauing onely sparinge of paper, be  
 passed ouer with silence: the gaine, or rather lacke of  
 losse, shalbe thine good Reader, not being by reading of  
 such long leude impertinēt trifles, occasioned to spend  
 and loose thy good time. I haue, I confesse bene some-  
 what long and tedious herein good Reader. But where  
 as the aduersaries of the truth, continually charging  
 Christian Princes with plaine violence, and robberte,  
 with tyzannie, sacrilege, and Antichristianisme, and  
 with mingling of heauen and earth together, by suche  
 most vntrue and sclaunderous repoites, labouring to  
 bying seely subiectes into euill suspicion of their good  
 Princes, and the Princes, and vs together, for mainte-  
 ning of the truth, into the baitred of as many as wyll  
 open their eares to suche sclaunderous lies: to deliuer  
 Christian Princes, from suche hainous reproches, our  
 selves

Dorm. fo. 26. &  
 27. &c.

selfes from suche false sleaundes, and the good Reader, from all errour in this matier, I haue beene the boilder upon thy pacience. And that whiche I haue here summarily saide touching Christian Princes authoritie ouer Priestes, and in matiers Ecclesiasticall, I shal particularly in this proceſſe proue true, by the ancient practise of Gods church, both of the Jewes & Christians: not leauing any one reason or allegation. made to the contrary, vnanswered: to the full contentation and satisfiing, of all reasonable and indifferent Readers, by Gods grace, I doubt not.

*Dorman Fol. 18.*

To the first of these three what title Kinges and Princes haue, it shal if they haue any, be seene hereafter. But for Priestes you see to begin withall, an auncient commission out of the Scriptures: where almightie God speakinge to Aaron, vsed these woordes: *Præceptum sempiternum est in generationes vestras, vt habeatis scientiam discernendi inter sanctum & prophanum, inter pollutum & mundum, doceatisq; filios Israel omnia legumina mea: that is to saie, it is a precept that shall euer endure through all your generations to haue the knowledge to discern and put difference, betwene holy thinges and prophane, betwene cleane and polluted: and that you teache the children of Israel all my commaundementes.*

To whom gaue almightie God here the power to iudge of doctrine? Whom commaunded he to teache? any other then Aaron and his race which were Priestes?

*Nowell.*

¶ *Q.* Dorman doth here vse more constancie, than he is other wise in this booke accustomed. For not onelie this place of *Leuiticus* with the same beginninge and ending

Translated word for worde, out of Hosius. lib. 2. fol. 97. b. Audi ad Aaron: quid dixerit dñs ad Aaron: Præceptum sempiternum est in generationes vestras, &c. beginning and ending iust as doth Hosius: who cōcludeth th<sup>o</sup> as doth M. Dor. Cui dedit hic De<sup>o</sup> discernendi, cui docendi facultatē? Nōne Aaron & filijs eis sacerdotibus?

Ex Hosio lib. 2.  
fol. 97. b. 98. a.

ending last as may be, is by him translated out of Hosius his authour, woorde for woorde: but also all his termes of Scripture following, of the olde testament and the newe, in order as they lie there in Hosius, are here in M. Doymans booke orderly placed. Whiche facilitie in uttering of his matters, he dooth not commonly vse: but by the figure hysteron proteron, he maketh primos locos in Hosio nouissimos, & nouissimos primos, He setteth lightly places in Hosius befoze, in his booke behinde, and contrariwise. His plaine dealing here is prayse worthy. And he hath also well begunne with the Scripture, as knowing that the chiefe authoritie dooth belonge to it: and that in matters and controuersies of Religion, there is no sufficient profe without the Scriptures. But M. Dozman either lacked this remembrance, or had not this facultie at Hosius his hande, or els where, in his first proposition, of the necessitie of one head in Christes Church. In the profe whereof, he beginneth and continueth with mozte vaine allegations, nothing to his purpose, taken out of the blessed Martyr S. Cypriane, the ancient fathers S. Basil, S. Hierome, holy Les, &c. with reason naturall, with examples politicall, though al a wise and nothing at all to his purposed matter, of one head of Christes church here in earth. of the Scriptures there is long, and almost continuall silence with him in that parte, and that one onely text out of Deut. the. 17. so often so, lacke of moze woare repeted, not onely making nothing for the cause, but utterly defacing and ouerthrowing the same. But here fir, you haue Scriptures vpon Scriptures out of Leuiticus, Deuteronomie, and out of other Prophetes, as wel as out of Poises, out of the new testament also,  
as well

as well as the olde. And why so I pray you? forsooth because your Scriptures here alleaged, doe proue that, whiche no man denieth: that is, that Priestes shoulde haue knowledge to discern in matters of Religion, that in scruples of conscience, doubtles and controuersies of Religion, we ought to consult with y<sup>e</sup> learned Priestes: and that the Priestes ought to teache the people. For concludinge, you doe with Hosius, aske: *To whome gaue God here power to iudge doctrine? Whome commaunded God here to teache? any other than Aaron and his rase whiche were Priestes?* Why, we neuer denied but that godly & learned Priestes might accordinge to Goddes worde iudge of the sinceritie of doctrine, and teach: elles shewe where we haue denied it. But sir, I toulde you that I liked not this your firste pointe of your diuision, whiche is, *authoritie to iudge ouer doctrine, whiche is sounde and which other.* I said that knowledge was in this case necessarie, whiche you there make no mention of, but of onely authozitie. And now the first Scripture, which you bring to proue your saide firste pointe of authozitie, maketh no mention of authozitie at all, but it speaketh directly and onely of knowledge, which in this your firste pointe I missed, as by you not mentioned at all. Will it please you now to make your argument of this your firste terte, for the proufe of your firste pointe: can it be any other thā this? It is an eternal comaundement to al your generations that you haue knowledge to discern betwæne holy thinges & prophane, betwæne cleane and vnclane, and that you teach the childzen of Israell my commaundementes: Ergo, Priestes haue authozitie and power to iudge of doctrine. For so you must needes conclude, and so you doe in dæde cōclude, askinge, to whome gaue God

I

here

here y<sup>e</sup> power to iudge of doctrine but to Priestes: But  
 M. Dozman you do not reason substantially, fro know-  
 ledge, to power: and from a commaundement to be stu-  
 dious and to get knowledge, to discern and teache,  
 to the possession of authoritie and power to discern  
 and teache. It soloweth not, that if Priestes be com-  
 maunded to haue knowledge that they therefore haue  
 knowledge, no moze than it soloweth that all are god-  
 ly, that are commaunded so to be: muche lesse soloweth  
 it, that Priestes vpon commaundement to haue know-  
 ledge, haue authoritie or power if thei lacke knowledge.

\* Osee. 4. b. 6.

Quia tu sciētiā  
 repulisti, repellā  
 te ne fungaris  
 mihi sacerdo-  
 tio.

Esa. 28. b. 7.

Sacerdotes nef-  
 cierūt Dominū,  
 ignorauerunt  
 iudicium. & Ie-  
 rem. 2. b. 3. & 4.

c. 9. Tenentes

legem nescierūt  
 me: obstupescēt  
 sacerdotes: &  
 Ezech. 7. g. 25.

Lex peribit à sa-  
 cerdote & sex-  
 centa huiusmo-  
 di.

And if the Priestes disobeying God, commaunding them  
 to haue knowledge (as \* in sondrie places of the Scrip-  
 tures it is recorded, the Iuishe priestes did) be ignozant,  
 and wicked, erringe from the right way both vpon the  
 right hande, and left, and so losinge knowledge to dis-  
 cerne and teache, where is than their authoritie and  
 power to discern and teache? A blinde mā that lacketh  
 sight to iudge colours, what authoritie can he haue to  
 iudge colozs? Now that the Iuishe Priestes did lose  
 knowledge here commaunded, did erre them selves, and  
 bring others into errour, and so lost authoritie & power  
 to discern and teach, I shal plainly proue hereafter by  
 the very textes by M. Dozman alleaged. And if it fall  
 out that our popishe Priestes with them haue losse all  
 right knowledge: I truste it will fall out that they of  
 right, do retaine small authoritie, or power to discern,  
 or teache, & specially to iudge, which you goe about spe-  
 cially to proue. You will say: If the Pope or prelates be  
 ignozant, they may call their learned chapleines to the.  
 I answere so may Princes too: and the moze ignozant,  
 the Prelates be, the rather ought Princes so to do. You  
 wil say: princes haue nothing to do with such matiers:

so may you say, in dede, but you shall neuer be hal le to proue, y<sup>e</sup> Christian & godly p<sup>r</sup>inces may not rather haue to doe, with such matiers, than ignozaunt & wicked p<sup>r</sup>elates. In some we doe graunt that, which the Scripture here allaged doth teach, y<sup>e</sup> God hath geue<sup>n</sup> p<sup>r</sup>iestes a cōmaundement y<sup>e</sup> thei should haue knowledge to discern & teache, & that if they haue that knowledge they may discern and teach. We graunt this I say: *D. Dozman* hath no nēde to proue it. But he should proue y<sup>e</sup> whiche we doe denie, & whiche thei doe most constantly affirme, & first of al his p<sup>r</sup>esent p<sup>r</sup>opositio: *That the head of the church must needes be a Priest*, & that all men, p<sup>r</sup>inces, and other are bounden of necessitie to obey al the Popes definitions & Judgements, without any discussing oz examining at al, as *Pighius* teacheth. Or which is all one, that if the mater decreed be spiritual, & appertaininge to faith, the p<sup>r</sup>ince ought to obey without questio oz grudge, which are *D. Hardinges* woordes, oz, though *Bishops* be nether so wel learned, nether so godly as *Lay men* be, yea though they be of a shameful life, y<sup>e</sup> yet a *Lay man* be he of neuer so great dignitie, holines, wisedome, ye though he excell in al vertue, may in no wise dispute oz reason, yea oz once moue any questio oz falke of causes Ecclesiasticall. Which woordes piked out of an oration of the Emperour *Basilius* by *Hosius*, & by you *D. Dozman* piked out of *Hosius*, you both doe allowe as a true, & most godle sayinge: as your custome is alwates to receiue all sayinges and examples not of *Princes* onely, but of all men what so euer they be, that doe abase *Christian Princes* vnder *Priest*es, and to reiect all sayinges of *Princes*, *Priest*es, and al men, if they sounde any thing for the prerogatiue of *Christian Princes*. These be your sayinges: these sayinges we say are moiste false,

*Pighius* Hierarch. lib. 6. cap. 13. fol. 33. c.

*D. Hard. Cōfut. Apol.* fol. 302. a. in principio.

*Hosi. lib. 2.* fol. 118. a.

*Basilij oratio pijssima.*

*Dormā fol. 23. b*

and wicked: as those that mainteine the Pope, and his popishe Priestes in all their fallhōde, and abusing of Christian Princes and the whole worlde. These sayinges if you goe aboute to proue, your authour Hosius and you shall finde as great scarcitie of textes of the Scripture for you, as you now haue plentie, to proue that which neither we, noz no man els doth denie: y is, y Priestes may, and ought to teach, according to Gods worde: and that the aduise, and iudgement of Priestes, as men learned in Goddes worde, is in doubttes and controuersies to be required, and solowed also, as long as they answere, and geue sentence accoꝛdinge to Goddes worde: and other than this proue not those places of the Scriptures by you boꝛowed of Hosius, and here so plentifully alleaged as shal in the processe plainly appeare.

Further I would M. Dozman had taken the whole matier with him. God in the same chapter commaunded Aaron and his rase, that they shoulde drinke no wine whan they entered into the tabernacle of testimonie. Ergo, the popishe Priestes muste drinke no wine that day they enter into the Church: specially that day they say Masse.

Item Aaron & his rase had wiues: Ergo, the popishe Priestes muste haue so too. These argumentes haue both better forme and matter than M. Dozmans argumente: for they doo directly conclude from those Priestes to these, in the same matiers, not in diuers, as it is in M. Dozmans argument: and were the conclusions admitted, popishe Sir Johns shoulde be lesse Drunkardes, and Whoremungers than they be.

And why these argumentes shoulde not conclude, as well,

well, yea rather than the others, let *M. Dorman* shewe a reason. For concerning iudgement of doctrine, which is sounde, whiche other wise, howe can they be iudges thereof, whiche either haue no iudgement at all, suche *Asses* they be: or if they haue any iudgement, are the chiefe cozrupters of all sounde, and teachers of all cozrupte doctrine: other wyse suche iudgement as is agreeable to Gods woorde, whiche apperteineth to the office of a godly learned Bishop or *Prefste*, we neuer denied. Concerning the other part of your question, *whom commaunded God here to teache, any other than Aaron and his rase whiche were Priestes?* We do not strine with you about the teaching of the people (as you your selues doo well knowe, and a little hereafter confesse, that you doo so knowe) so that they do teache *Legitima Domini*, that is, according to Gods Lawe, as is in this place of *Leuiticus* by you here alleaged, expressed: els if they teache their owne phantasies and inventions, (as the Pope, his *Prelates*, with popishe *Prefstes*, monkes, and friers, haue of long time done) I geue you plainely to vnderstande, that this place maketh nothing for them, but onely to the condemnation of them & their doctrine, and the discharge of vs disobeiyng them so not teaching *Legitima Domini*. And thus you make here a dubble fault. First in labouring by the Scriptures so diligently to proue that, whiche we denie not, and whiche your selfe doth knowe and confesse that we denie not. Secondly, for that you bzing, in the profe of this first part of your diuision, that, whiche doth appertelne to your thirde parte thereof, of the ministerie of the woorde: & so you mengling togeather the partes of your diuision, befoze by you separate, doo make (as you terme suche

*Dorman post fo. 20. a.*

*Legitima mess*

*Post. fol. 29.*

bealing) an hotchpot thereof. Besides that, Moses in that chapter controwleth Aaron the high priest: and he being admonished holdeth his peace. Which is a shew place, signifying that the high Priest whē he offendeth is subiect to controulement. But your Pope, though he go to the Deuill him selfe, and bringe thousandes thither wth him by his wickednes, yet may no man be so hardy to reprove him, so that this. x. chapter of Leviticus can not make for suche a supreamacte as the Pope claimeth. And I do beleaue that M. Dozman will not like, that Aaron should be a figure of the Pope, whē he is cōtrouled: but onely when the figure maketh for any Lordliness, then it is authenticall.

Dist. 40.  
Cap. Si Papa.

Dorman. Fol. 18.

These two places are likewise briefly ioyned together in Hosius, li. 2. fo. 97. a D. Hard, intreateth at large vpon this place Cōfut. Apo. fol. 307. vwho borrowed it of Hosius li. 2. f. 57. 58. & c. where it is also largely handled.

In the booke of Deut. saith he not also that if there arise any *Cap. 17.* harde or doubtfull question, the Priest must be consulted, that he that of pride will spurne against his ordinance, shall suffer death therefore? And againe in the same booke in an other place, that vpon *Cap. 22.* the Priestes woorde all causes shall hange.

Nowell.

Here is a singular diligence by M. Dozman shewed, who rather then he will omitte any thing for him, will not sticke to rehearse one thing tenne times. This is al the textes of Scripture, he could finde for the prooofe of his first proposition of the necessitie of one head of the Church, whiche yet repeted five or sixe tymes, he hath by art made same as many, and not content therewith, he hath placed it here in the firste fronte of his prooofes of his seconde proposition, that the saide head must of necessity be a Priest, to furnishe and make by the mustre here  
also:

also. And I beleaue he will not leaue it so, and good reason he hath, not to let this terte lightlie scape hym, seying Hosius his authour, hath it here in order with the reste, as hath M. Dozman, and els where very often: and by often repetinge of this terte, and large discoursing vpon the same, hath geuen him to vnderstand, that it is a principall place for their purpose. Whiche hath also caused D. Hardinge, so largely to handle the same terte. For the explication whereof, good Reader, that I be not to exceedingly tedious, I remitte thee to the leaues of my booke befoze, where I haue at large saide to this place, and proued it to make againste the Popes Supreamacte.

Hosius. li. 2. foli.  
57. 55. &c. & 97.  
b. &c.

D. Hard. Cōfus.  
Apolo. fo. 307.  
prolixo. fol. 59.  
60. &c.

In this place I wyll onely saie this, that we would wishe that the Priestes were so well learned that they coulde, and so Godlie that they would, truely discuss all harde and doubtfull questions: wee shoulde surely muche reioyce thereof. But in this ignorance and malice of Popishe Priestes, neither doth this, nor any other place of the Scripture, forbidde a Christia Prince, to examine whether the Priest of ignorance doo erre in his saynges, or of malice swaue from the truth. Yea, notwithstanding this commaundement of obedience to the highe Priest geuen here, the highe Priest him selfe was obedient, to his Lorde and Prince Moses, whan he had offended, praiyng hym, his Lorde, not to be angry with him, as doth at large in the said booke of Deuteronomie, and in Exodus, and Numeri, appeare. And in this very same place is mention made of the Iudge also, who is in this case soynded with the hyghe Priest. Besides that, the Priest is bounden to Iudge accordyng to Gods woorde, accordyng to

Exod. 32. c. 28  
Ne indignetur  
Dñs meus. &c.

whiche

Whiche whyles he iudgeth, no man refuseth his iudgement, as I befoze haue noted vpon the woordes *Legitima mea*. But if the highe Prieste shall saye or iudge contrary to Gods woorde, that he is to be obeted, neither by this, nor by any other place of the Scriptures, can be proued. The woordes out of the. 21. chapter of Deut. are by *M. Dozman* very generally alleaged thus. *That vpon the Priestes woordes all causes shall hang.* But seing *Hosius* hath so done, so must it needes be with *M. Dozman*: the texte is thus. *The whole matier shall depende vpon their woorde*: and the matier is there, the inquirie of vnknozen murther, which now the crowner hath moze to doo withall then the Priestes. *Hosius* and *M. Dozman*s argument, standeth thus: In a case of an vnknozen murther amongst the Iewes, all the matier did depende vpon the Priestes woorde. Ergo, all matters of our Religion must depend vpon Popish priestes woordes. In daede if priestes be Crowners in Polonia, this texte serueth *Hosius* for one matter, better than it serueth *M. Dozman*: but for all matters, it serueth them bothe a like, that is neuer a whitte at all. And seing this text, speaketh specially of secret murthers, he hath not doone wisely, to leaue the chalenge of the authoritie of Priestes, in iudgement vpon such murthers: for seing he doth therby claime authoritie vnto priestes ouer all matters, whereof the texte speaketh not, he shoulde not haue lefte the claime of authoritie in that matter, whiche it specially speaketh of. Further, that place speaking of Priestes in the plurall numbze, vpon whose woorde all causes (as *M. Dozman* hath translated) shall hang, and not of the highe Priest onely, doth ouertholue the supzematie of one onely Priest, and so marreth

Deut. 21.  
Ad verbum eorum  
omne negotium  
pendet.

Ad verbum eorum  
omne negotium  
pendet.

marreth all the matter. For if all causes shall hange  
 vpon the worde of the Priestes, than are no causes spe-  
 cially reserued for this one high Priest, whiche is di-  
 rectly against the Romish Reseruata & casus Papales,  
 and his whole supremacie. Moreover, where the Scrip-  
 tures do attribute, ought to the Priestes word in mat-  
 ters of Religion, if these wordes Legitima mea, re-  
 quirent legem meam, verbum meum, or suche like, be  
 not (as they vsually are) exprested, yet are they alwaye  
 to be vnderstanded, according to the examples out of the  
 Prophetes Ezechiel, Aggeus, and Malactias; by M.  
 Dozman streight hereafter alleaged. And good reason  
 it is, that **A**ll causes should depend vpon Gods word,  
 with the whiche if the Priestes wordes do agree, we  
 will gladly agree with their wordes, els, we are com-  
 maunded to enquire of the Priestes, not what is the  
 Priestes phantasie, but what is Goddes Lawe, wherein  
 Priestes should haue knowledge, and thereafter gyue  
 answer. If they do not, there is no necessitie of obey-  
 ing them: but there is alwayes a necessitie of obeying  
 of God and his holy worde.

*Legitima mea,  
legem requirit.*

*Dorman. Folio. 18.*

*Ezechiel the prophet doth he not witnesse the same? and when there is any controuersie (saith he) they shall stay in my iudgements and giue iudgement.*

Translated out  
 of Hosius. lib. 2.  
 fol. 97. b.

*Nowell.*

Ezechiel the Prophet hath these wordes in the  
 chapter by M. Dozman out of Hosius alleaged. Caput  
 autem suum non radent. &c. that is to saie. They (the  
 Priestes) shall not shauē their heades, not haue longe  
 to heare,

all Poppythe Priestes, whiche haue not stayed in Gods iudgementes from being iudges, and from being his Priestes also at all, besides this restraint in this place may apeare by that the said Prophet in this very chapter by you here alleaged, saeth further, after this sorte. *Leuitæ qui longe recesserunt a me. &c.* That is to saie: suche Leuites or priestes as haue departed farre from me in the error of the childre of Israel, and haue erred from me after their Idols, and haue bozne their own wickednes, &c: these shal not approche nere to me, to haue any priesthood befoze me, neither shal thei come nere to my sanctuary, but they shal beare their own confusion or shame, and their ston wickednes, which they haue wrought: and I wil make them portars, and other the basest officers &c. and those Priestes & Leuites the children of Sadock, whiche haue kepte my Lawes and ceremonies, and haue not erred from me, they shal approche to me, be my Priestes, serue me, & be these Iudges here spoken of. Thus farre are the very wordes of the Prophete in the same chapter by you alleaged *9. Dozman.* Whereby it is euident, that all suche as are Priestes, or be so called, haue not by and by authoritie to iudge, but that it is further required, that they be learned, and Godlike men, and obseruers of Gods Lawes and ordinaunces: els if they be (as be your Popes and all his Poppythe Priestes.) Idolaters, erring from God, and his holy Lawes, corrupters of his worde, seducers of his people (suche as are in the saide Prophet, and same place described.) they muste holde them selfe contented to be porters, dooze keepers, and iudges, and not presume to be Iudges, beyng in deede corrupters, to be iudged, and condemned also.

I knowe

*Iuxta sancta  
sanctorum.*

*Facti sunt domus  
Israel, in offendiculum iniquitatis.*

I know that an vnworthe Priest ministering the ho-  
ly Sacramentes doth (as S. Augustine teacheth) nothing  
hurt, nor hinder Goddes Sacramentes: but that igno-  
rant or corrupt Priestes shalbe iudges in doubttes of re-  
ligion, neither S. Augustine, nor no other learned and  
godly father will allowe. And the prophete Ezechiel  
here appointeth suche their offices, to be doze keepers,  
and iudges, not iudges. This is the true sense of the  
Prophet Ezechiel in that place and chapter: then the  
whiche there is not in the olde Testament a more ef-  
fectuous place against your whole purpose, of sonde po-  
pish Priestes to be iudges, lightly to be founde M. Doz-  
man, & yet must you dashe vs in the teeth with a patche  
thereof. But in deede it is no reason to require more of  
M. Dozman, than Cardinal Hosius hath performed.

Dorman Fol. 18.

\* Aggeus and Malachias, prophetes bothe, bid they vs enquire  
for the law of God, at the Priestes handes, or at the kinges? No assu-  
redly, they sende vs not to Kinges (whiche had they beene the chiefe  
gouernours in those matters without faile they woulde haue done)  
but to the Priestes: whose lippes they promise, shall not misse to  
keepe the true knowledge, because they are our lordes Angels. Haue  
we any suche warrant of worldly Princes? No truly. And were it  
not more then necessary that we should if princes should rule them  
in matters of Religion, of whome these woordes be spoken?

Nowell.

These places of Aggeus and Malachias the Pro-  
phetes hath Hosius M. Dozmanns authout lit above a  
dosen places. Wherefore M. Dozman hath done right  
well not to ouer passe them with silence, but to toyne  
them

\* Trāslated out  
of Hosius fol. 98.  
a. & alijs locis.  
Hosius li. 2. fol.  
58. b. Clara sunt  
apud Aggāū &  
Malachiā scrip-  
turae uerba, qui-  
bus interrogare  
legē à sacerdo-  
tib⁹ iubet &c.

& mox. Inter-  
roga sacerdotes  
legem dixit Ag-  
gāus, nō inter-  
roga principes.  
Lib. eodē fol. 43.  
Dei digito scrip-  
tum est, labia  
sacerdotis custo-  
diūt sciētiā &c.  
Hosius ibidem,  
fol. 58. b. Profe-  
rant uel uauum  
scripturae locū,  
ubi legem ex ore  
principis requi-  
rere iuss⁹ sit &c.

Lib. 2. fol. 18.

&amp; 18.

Aggeus. 1. &amp; 2.

Dormā fol. 19. 2.

them both together as *Hosius* in diuers places doth, & to translate worde for worde out of his authoꝝ, as his manner is. But I doe answere *Hosius* thus, that of these two, *Aggeus* speakinge ioinally by *Goddes* commaundement of *Zorobabell* the *Princke* of *Juda*, and of *Iesus* the high *Prieste*, siue times, doth euer place first in the reherfall the *Duke Zorobabell* as chiefe, before *Iesus* the high *Priest*, & sheweth first, that the *Princke* was readie to heare and to doe the *Lozdes* worke, & after the high *Priest*: and declareth firste, that *God* did stirre by the spirite of the *Princke*, and afterwarde of the highe *Priest*, and last of all of the people: and he exhorteth and comforteth the *Princke* first, and than the highe *priest*, & last of al the people. Which orde of reherfal so often by *Goddes* holy spirite kepte, doth evidently declare the dignities of these iii. states, the *Princke*, the *Priest*, and the people, one after an other. Neither may *M. Dormā* reiect this kinde of reasoning: for he vseth the same him selfe, streight after goinge about to proue, that *Princes* can not clayme the chiefe place of gouernement in the *Churche* by the worde *gubernationes* *gouernementes*, in *S. Pauls* epistle to the *Corinthians*, for that the saide worde is placed so farte of from the firste and chiefe place. This is *M. Dormāns* reason, and these be his very woordes: wherefoze I pray him by this his owne reason of placinge, to let the *Princke Zorobabell* haue the chiefe *preeminence*, the chiefe place aboute the highe *Priest*, sauinge he is by the iudgement of the holy *Ghost* so often and effectually, so placed before him. And whereas the worke of the *Lozde* where of the *Prophete* entreateth, and wherevnto he exhorteth & encozageh first the *Princke*, and after the highe *Priest*, (keepinge that orde continually

nually when he speaketh of them both together,) was the restoringe and reedifyinge of the temple, (whiche is a very figure of the restoringe of Religion decayed) it foloweth that in the reforminge and restoringe of Religion, the chiefe partes are the godly Princes.

I doe know that your maister D. Hardinge saith thus:

The hearinge and determininge of doubtfull causes may be taken, that either the Prieste alone herde and determined a meere Spirituall controversie, as whether a disease were the lepre or no; or that the iudge alone determined a meere Temporall matter, as what punishment this or that traitour, shoulde have: or that bothe together shoulde determine a cause of mixte lawe and iudgement, as in what manner the Temple ought to be repayed &c. these be D. Hardinges wordes; and a man may marvelle why he woulde have the determininge, whether a disease be the lepre or no, to be a meere Spirituall matter, voide of all Tempozalitie: and the determininge howe the Temple ought to be repayed, to be a cause mixte with Tempozalitie and Spirituallitie together. By the same tempozalitie and spiritualitytie together, by the same reason bilike, the popishe Cleargie hath reserved causes, of adulterie and whozedom, as matiers meere Spirituall, to their owne onely cognition and iudgement. Surely in the

D. Hard. Cōfuta  
Apol. parte  
sexta. fol. 307. b.

Concil. Calcedon. Act. 3. fol. 867. col. 1. Sicut Zorobabell, & Iesus Ecclesie Hierusalē adificationem renouare circa dogmata adnitentes. &c.

That the saide determininge in what manner the temple ought to be

be repaired; be a cause of mixte lawe, and iudgement: both it  
 not evidently followe thereof, that the Prince hauinge  
 the chiefe place appoinced him by the holy Ghost about  
 the high Priest continually (as here in Aggeus the pro-  
 phete hath Zorobabell the Prince about the high priest  
 Jesus) is the chiefe in the determination of that cause  
 of mixte lawe and iudgement: in whiche mixte cause,  
 seeinge there is spirituallitie, as well as tempoꝛalltie,  
 why did not the holy Ghost firste place the high Priest  
 befoze the Prince, in case he were in daede the chiefe in  
 that determination. But whan D. Hardinge and other  
 Papistes do speake of spiritual men and maters in such  
 sorte, as though godly Christian Princes labouringe  
 accordinge to Goddes lawe, to subdue the fleshe vnto  
 the spirit were no spirituall men, noz may medle with  
 spirituall maters, oz maters of Religion, but that their  
 Priestes onely be spirituall men, & they onely to medle  
 in spirituall maters: they do in so sayinge and in suche  
 diuision not solowe the Scriptures, who though they  
 teache a distinction of offices of Priestes, and other that  
 be no Priestes, oz Lay men: yet haue the Scriptures no  
 distinction of spiritualitie in Priestes onely, from other  
 godly Christian Lay me, & specially Christian Princes,  
 who in all wisdom, godly knowledge, & life, that is to  
 say, in true spiritualitie, shoulde so farre excell the bul-  
 gar sort, as they do excell them in dignitie. To procede,  
 God him selfe doth not onely throughtout the whole pro-  
 phete Aggeus place the Prince befoze the highe Priest  
 continually, when he speaketh of them both together,  
 but also speaking of the Prince alone, declareth his most  
 speciall fauour towardes him by these very woꝛdes: I  
 will take thee vnto me Zorobabell my seruant, & make  
 thee

thee as my signet, because I haue chosen thee saith the  
 Lozde God of hostes: than the whiche sayinge there is  
 none spoken of any high priest moze notable. But if D.  
 Dozman say this is spoken in figure, & that Christ here  
 is mente by Zoꝛobabell: well, what so euer is alleaged  
 foꝛ the Pope oꝛ his popish priestes out of the old Testa-  
 ment, is plaine as a packe staffe, and true simplie with-  
 out figure. But it pleaseeth me right well that S. He-  
 rone & other interpreters do declare, that God in this  
 place hath chosen the Prince to be the figure of Christes  
 kingdome, & the high Priest to be the figure of Christes  
 Priesthode: in whiche resemblance, sainge the godly  
 Prince is so often and ordinarily placed befoze the high  
 Priest, argueth that the Prince who firste figureth  
 Christe, the vndoubted head of the Church, whiche is  
 Christes kingdome here in earth, is superiour to the  
 high Priest. And as the Papistes can shewe no cause,  
 why Christes kingdome in his Church, and ouer all,  
 should be inferiour to his priesthood: so can they shoue  
 no cause, why the godly Prince resemblinge Christes  
 kingdome, either in the church, oꝛ ouer all, should be  
 inferiour to the godly highe priest, resemblinge his  
 priesthode: foꝛ his kingdome is as eternall and glo-  
 rious, as his priesthode, and both in deede mozte glozi-  
 ous. I knowe that D. Harding woulde haue Christes  
 priesthode to include his kingdome, as the greater of-  
 fice includeth the lesse, to proue thereby a Christian  
 Prince to be inferiour to a priest: but he onely saith so, &  
 proueth it not, neither can he euer be hable to proue it.

Hieron. in Ag-  
 gæum.

D. Hard. Cōfut.  
 Apol. 305. a.

Now concerning the other prophete Malachie: God  
 there inueyeth against the couetousenes, disobedience, &  
 contempt of his Priestie, which was in the Priestes, &

he threateneth them, that he will bringe them to beggerie, curse their Blessinges, and blesse their cursinges, and that he will throwe in their faces the dounge of their solemnities. Wherefoze I thinke Hosius, and M. Dozman shall finde small aide in these Prophetes for the preferment of Priestes befoze Princes, or for the Jurisdiction of Priestes in matters Ecclesiasticall. For what Jurisdiction I pray you, leaue[n]eth God to these Priestes, whose sentences he will reuerse, whose blissinges he will curse, whose cursinges he will blesse: that is, what so euer they binde, the Worde will lose: what so euer they lose, the Worde will binde: and he gyueth small honour to suche Judges, in whose faces he threateneth, he will throwe the dounge.

Stercus solem-  
nitarū vestrarū.

Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. 78. b.  
Interroga sacer-  
dotes legē, dix-  
it Aggæus, non  
interroga prin-  
cipes. &c.

But saith Hosius out of M. Dozmanns penne, these Prophetes bid vs to enquire of the lawe at the priestes handes, and not at the Kinges. Yea, so woulde I bidde any man that woulde be resolued in the lawes of this Realme, to require it at the iudges handes, rather than the Princes: and yet doth that not proue the Judges to be superiour in Jurisdiction ciuill to the Prince. I woulde aske of M. Dozman in case he were in doubtte in his Canon lawe, whether he woulde require the resolution thereof of the Pope (who hath bene oftentimes so ignozant that he knewe not his Grammer, as is by Papistes, that knewe the truethe, testified) or of some notable Lawier well studied in the saide lawes. M. Hardinge your maister M. Dozman, doth confesse that Pectarius the great Patriarke of Constantinople, did learne the beste waie in moste weightie controuersies of Religion, of one Sisinus: who though he were a  
great

Alphonfus de  
Castro. li. 1. ca. 4  
D. Hard. C6fur.  
Apol. fol. 314. b.

greate Clarke, yet was he but a poze reader in a poze  
 Churche vnder the Pouatiane Bishoppe Agelius, as  
 witnesseth Socrates in his Ecclesiasticall Historie. Lib. 5. cap. 10.  
 Wherefore vnlesse you will graunt the poze reader, to  
 haue bene superiour to that great Patriarke, for that  
 the Patriarke (as saith your mayster) asked, and vsed  
 his aduise, you do inconsiderately mengle together au-  
 thozitie and knowledge, as though there shoulde be  
 alwaies greatest authozitie, where is the greatest  
 knowledge: whiche if it be true, the authozitie of the  
 Pope vsuallie moste ignozant, doth lie in the duste.

Baldus.

Papa est doctor  
 vtriusque legis  
 nō scientia, sed  
 autoritate.

Againe I say, as we are contented to require the  
 Lawe at the Priestes handes: so are the Priestes  
 bounden to answere accordinge to the law of God: from  
 the whiche if they swarue, we are not bounden to heare,  
 or obey them.

Nowe where you say M. Dorman, that these Pro-  
 phetes doo promise that the Priestes lippes shall not misse to keepe  
 the true knowledge, because they are our Lordes Angelles: you  
 doo scarcely deale sincerely herein. Hosius your au-  
 thour saith: Dei digito scriptum est. Labia sacer-  
 dotis custodiunt scientiam &c. that is to say: It is  
 writen with the finger of God: the lippes of the Priestes  
 doo keepe knowledge. You say, the Prophetes doo promise  
 that the Priestes lippes shall not misse to keepe the true knowledge.

Custodiunt.

Custodient.

Wherby it is euident that either your authour Hosius,  
 or you, missed to keepe true translation, for though one  
 once haue the keepinge of a thinge, it foloweth not by &  
 by he hath a promise neuer to misse of the keeping ther-  
 of. And if this (custodiunt scientiā) thei doo keepe know-  
 ledge, was writen with Gods finger, as Cardinall Ho-  
 sius his fingers, by writinge doo testifie, than was your  
 promise,

promise, that the Priestes lippes shall nor misse to keepe true knowledge, written with **D.** Dozmans fingers onely. For Gods worde, written with his owne finger in that Prophet, doeth declare plainly and largely, that the lippes of those Priestes did faile to keepe true knowledge, and that therfoze they had no certaine promise not to misse to keepe it: as you haue here with your fingers written. I wil reherse the wordes of the prophete moze largely, for it is to the purpose so to doo, *lex veritatis fuit in ore eius*, &c. (saith the prophete Malachie) that is to say: *¶* lawe of truth was in his mouth (he speaketh of Leuie) and wickednes was not founde in his lippes: he walked with me in peace and equitie, & turned many from iniquitie: for the lippes of the Priest should or ought to keepe knowledge, (for both **S.** Hierome and the procelle it selfe sheweth that the worde custodient so signifieth,) and they shall require the lawe of his mouth: for he is the Angell or legate of the Lord of hostes. But you (Priestes) haue departed from the way, & haue caused many to offende against the lawe: you haue broken the couenaunt of Leuie, saith the Lord God of hostes. Wherefoze I haue made you to be in contempt & without estimation amongst al people, as you haue not kept my waies, but haue had respect to persons in iudgement. Hitherto haue I rehearsed the terte of the Prophet: vpon the which **S.** Hierome hath these wordes: *Describitur ex persona Dei, perfecti officii sacerdotis* &c. that is to say: the office of a perfect Priest is described in Gods person, and what manner of man the saide priest should be, & what manner of man God would haue him to be, who commaunded him so to be, &c. thus saith **S.** Hierome of *¶* first parte, what priestes should be, of the seconda

Custodient.  
Hierom. in 2.  
Malach transla-  
teth it Custodi-  
ent.

Acceperitis facie  
vel personam in  
legc.

Ex persona Dei.

second part, what they were in deede, S. Hierome saith thus: Vos autem recessistis de via &c. that is. But you haue departed from the waye &c. the sense is: I woulde haue had you done the thinges, which are contained in the first part, wherof I spake by Moyles in Deuteronomie: Geue to Leuite his doctrine, and truthe to that righteous man &c. But you haue declined and gone from the right waye: notwithstandinge that I saide, thou shalt not decline, neither to the right hande, nor to the left. To decline to the right hande, is to absteyne from meates, which God hath created to vse, and to condene marriage, and to offende against that, whiche is written in an other place: be not to righteous. To turne to the left hande, is, whan one geueth him selfe to lust and vncleanesse, and offendeth many in the Lawe, whom it were better to haue a mille stone tied to his necke, and to be cast into the Sea, than to offende one of the little ones &c. thus farre S. Hierome vpon this place of the Prophete Malachie. By the plaine text theresoze, and by S. Hieromes exposition it plainly appeareth, that God maketh a comparison betwene Leuite and the ould godly Priestes, betwene the wicked Priestes of those latter daies: and that God made them not promesse what they should not faile to do, but telleth them what had beene their duttie to haue doone: that is, that they ought to haue kept knowledge. As the like phrascs, thou shalt feare the Lorde thy God: thou shalt walke in his waye: thou shalt not decline to the right hande, nor to the left: (whiche S. Hierome in the exposition of this place also, alleageth) thou shalt not strale, and other places like to this by M. Dozman here alleaged, contayne no promesse, that we shall certainly do so, but

Quæ priore capitulo continentur.

Dicente me.

Eccle. 7. 6.

Deuter. 5.  
Exod. 20.

Deuter. 12.

Hæc sunt præcepta  
et iudicia, quæ facere  
debetis.

a commandement, and declaration, what we ought to do: as by the Scriptures in other places, is evidently expressed, as in this text for example. These be y<sup>e</sup> preceptes and iudgements, which ye ought to do. For as it appeareth by our continuall failing to do these thinges, that we had no certain promise of God, that we should not faile to do thê: so, that no promise was here made, that the Priestes lippes should not misse to keepe true knowledge, (as M. Dozman saith) appeareth evidently by that immediatly after he sheweth, they had misse to kepe it, & had erred most shamefully, from the waye, both vpon the right hand, & the left, and that therfore all people should despise thê, because they had deceiued the people, & had not answered according to Gods Lawe, but had caused the people, that did credit & folow them, to erre from Gods Lawe. And therefore, as befoze was touched, he thzeatneth that he will make them poore, & beggerly, will cast donge in their faces, will curse their blessinges, and blesse their cursinges. Loe M. Dozman here is the authozitie and iurisdiction of your Pope and Popishe priestes, who haue likewise lost knowledge, & swarued from the right waye, bothe vppon the righte hande, by absteyning from meates, and mariage, and forbidding them to others, as vnlawfull: and vpon the left hande, by their vile life in suche impure celibat offending many, truely and liuely by the Prophet Malachie, and S. Hierome described: here are the causes of the beggerie and contempt, whereunto you beginne to growe, plainly and truely set forth. Wherefore you haue dealt insyncerely with the Prophet, and deceitfully with Gods people, to drawe their saynges forcible to your purpose, to the whiche they are most contrarie:

trarie: going about moſte falſely hereby to proue, that God had made a promeſſe that the lippes of your Popes and Popiſhe Prelates, and popiſhe ſir Johns, moſt ignorant doubtles and aſſes, a great parte of them, ſhould not miſſe to kepe true knowledge: whoſe blindnes, ignorance, errors, ſeducing, of the people, and the conſempt, pouertie, and decay in this world, and the curſe, and high indignation of God (whereinto for their ſaide faultes they are moſte iuſtly fallen) is by the Prophete Malachie moſt plainly & lively here depainted and ſet forth: S. Hierome vpon the ſame teſtiſyng, that ſuch doo in vaine bzagge of the dignitie of prieſthod, who doo not perſourme the dutties thereof.

Hier. in Mala. 2.  
Sacerdos ſi ignoratiã in ſcripturis ſanctis obtenderit, negligentem frustra iactat dignitatẽ cuius opera nõ exhibet.

Concerning the wordes Angelus Domini, which M. Dozman chaunging the numbze, hath traſlated our Lordes Angels, S. Hierome as well vpon the Prophete Aggeus, as Malachie here by M. Dozman alleged, doth expounde Angelus Domini, by this word, Nuncius, the meſſenger of the Lord, of ſhewing the will of the Lord to the people, ſaith S. Hierome. Which interpretation S. Hierome rather ſoloweth, y he might thereby deliuer from their error, ſuch as thought that Aggeus and Malachias the Prophetes, and John Baptiſt alſo (of whome the Scriptures doo vſe that phraſe of Angelus Domini) were Angels in deede. For S. Hierome vpon Aggeus witneſſeth that ſome than, had ſuche an opinion. I truſte M. Dozma meaneth not by terming prieſtes our Lordes Angels, to bring vs into y error, out of the which S. Hierome would deliuer vs, for though ſimple men, hearinge ſuche godly men, as were the oulde Prophetes, and prieſtes, termed Angeli Domini, y Lordes Angels, by occaſiõ of the title & their holines

Hier. in Agg. 2.  
verſus finem & Malach. 2.

holines together, might thinke them to be Angels in deede: yet sache is the life of our Popish Prelates, that no man can be brought by any title of the Angels of the Lorde, to them attributed, to thinke them therefore to be Angels in deede, excepte it be Angeli Domini mali, the euill Angels of the Lorde. And S. Hierome saith, that the title of the Lordes Angel, that is the Lordes messenger or Legate, is geuen to Priestes of showing the Lordes will to the people, for the whiche cause the saide Priestes ought to be learned and searchers of the truthe, as saith S. Hierome: and this wooorde Legate of the Lorde, importeth, that the Prieste ought to say no other thing than that whiche is geuen him in commission from the Lord. Seing therefore our Papistes, haue neither them selues preached the Lordes will, neither would suffer the people to knowe it, but, as muche as in them did lie, by keaping it hid from the people, vnder a straunge vnknown language, and by fearing of the people by al crueltie, from the seeking of the knowledg of the Lordes will, in steede whereof they haue taught their owne will, the title of Angeli Domini, the lordes Angels, messengers, or legates, cā in no sense be truely applied to them: vnlesse they may (as I saide) be termed Angeli Domini mali, the euill Angels of the Lorde: for that they plucke the good sēde of Gods wooorde, out of the hartes of the people, and in steede thereof, doe saue the darnell and cocke of their erronious traditions, and superstitions, after the example of the worst of al the Angels. Wherefore P. Dozman needeth not to bragge of this title, Angeli Domini, our Lordes Angels, as appertaining to their wicked, vnlearned doltishe, and dumbe Popishe Priestes. Where P. Dozman saith, we haue

haue no suche warrant for Princes, as be these for  
 Priestes. I would be soye if we had suche: for here they  
 haue none other warrant, but a declaration that they  
 haue broken all couenant and promise with God, and  
 all duitie towardes God, and man. And M. Dozman  
 may (if he list seeke) finde y<sup>e</sup> terme of Angelus Domini,  
 the Lordes Angel (as he expoundeth it,) and Christus  
 Domini also; the Lordes annoyned, or the Lordes  
 Christe, (for so I might saie by as good right, as he ter-  
 meth Priestes the Lordes Angels) not vnusualtie,  
 in the Scriptures applied to Princes. And in the ende  
 of the chapter of Aggeus by him here alledged, he may  
 finde a better warrant for Zozobabell the Prince, as I  
 haue befoze noted, than is here for the Priestes. And  
 God doth promise that kinges and Queenes shalbe the  
 foster fathers, and nourcetes of his Church, bothe to  
 guilde and to leade it. And the Scriptures saie that the  
 hartes of Princes are in the Lordes handes, and that  
 he doth turne them whither he will. Upon which terte  
 S. Augustine auoucheth, that he who will not doo  
 that, the whiche the truthe it selfe commaundeth him  
 by the hart of the kynge, both shalbe punished in this  
 worlde, and shall not be hable to shewe his face befoze  
 God: and S. Augustine affirmeth constantly, that who  
 soeuer (without exception) shal despise the commaunde-  
 ment of a godly Prince, in matters of Religion, procu-  
 reth him selfe iudgement or damnation. Whiche are  
 farre better warrantes for Princes, than M. Dozman  
 hath here any for Priestes.

Dorman Folia 12

But to proceede, is this authoritie geuen to them onelie in the

M

olde

Eti. 49.

Prouerb. 21.

August. Epi. 166.

ad Donatistas.

Quando autem

Imperatores ve-

ritate tenent, &

ipsa veritate co-

tra errore iubet

quod quisquis

contempserit, ipse

sibi iudiciu acqui-

rit. Na & in ter

hoes pœnas luit,

& apud Deū frō-

tem nō habebit,

qui hōe facere

noluit, quod ei

per cor Regis

ipsa veritas iul-

lit. &c.

Translated out  
of Hosius. lib. 2.  
fol. 45. a. & 98. a.

D. Hard. hath  
the same Cōfut.  
Apol. fol. 298. b.  
& 320. b.

Ex Ephc. 4.

olde testament are they not put trowe you, in as great truste in the  
newe? Or are they thinke you excluded and kinges admitted there-  
to? If it had been so neuer would's. Paule that blessed Apostle, haue  
made his accompte, that God had placed in his churche, first A-  
postles, next to them Prophetes, then doctours, and so furth. Emongest  
all the whiche, although that frantick foole that preachinge not  
many yeeres sence at Paules Crosse, went about with his raylinge  
Rhetoricke, to make his audience as foolis he as he was made, in  
beleninge that this place shoulde make against the authoritie of  
the Pope, because forsoth he coulde he saide, finde no roume for him  
there: and therefore of his charitie wished, that if any good fel-  
lowe emongest his audience were wearie of his rowme he might be  
placed there: as verily I both thinke and knowe there were manie,  
that wished bothe them selues a waie, and him in Bedlem emongest  
his compaignions, neuer to come more in pulpit, especiallie in that  
place, to dishonour the vniuersitie his mother, from whence he  
came, by suche vnreasonable not reasoning but rayling: although he  
saie, coulde finde there no place for the Pope, he might yet haue  
with his yong sight found at the last that, which Iohn Caluin could  
before with his olde and dimme eyes espie out, that is, that the  
chiefest place of gouernement in Christes Churche, belonged to the  
Apostles, and so to Bishoppes and Priesies their successors. Except  
his braine would serue him to saie, that Christes Churche died with  
his Apostles.

Li. 4. Inl  
ca. 3. sect.

Nowell.

Hosius. li. 2. fol.  
45. a. & 98. a.

Powe M. Dozman hath doone with the ould Testa-  
ment, and made an ende thereof with Hosius, he doth  
well to proccade with him to the new Testament, and  
beginning with the same terte of S. Paule to the Co-  
rinthians, as doth Hosius, to take the whole treatie  
with him in order as it lieth.

Nowe where S. Paule hath the same terte in ef-  
fecte

fede in his Epistle to the Ephesians, **D. Hardinge** no-  
 ted his booke in the margent thus. *1. Corinth. 12.* and  
*ad Ephe. 4.* Wherefoze Doctor Hardinge, who bozow-  
 eth as false of Hobins, as dothe **D. Dozman**, diuers  
 times alleaginge this **S. Paules** rehersall of Ecclesi-  
 asticall ministers, seinge **D. Dozman** had catched the  
 first note. *1. Corinth. 12.* doth with discretion make his  
 note continually *Ex Ephe. 4.* and not *1. Corinth. 12.* as dothe  
**D. Dozman**. But who it is that **D. Dozman** here, of  
 that his charitie and pitie (whiche he toold vs of befoze)  
 calleth frantike foole, and mad man, and woulde haue  
 placed in Beethleem, I do not certeinlie knowe. But  
 if he haue a delight to raike vpon suche, who by sickness,  
 or other wise, haue had sometime an idle head, he may  
 amongst his nereest acquaintance & friends of the Pa-  
 pistes, finde matter enough to gnawe vpon with that  
 tooth, till he bzeake it to peeces agalife, and if he accor-  
 ding to his wishe, that such were in Bedleem amongst  
 their companions, all should not be in Louaine, & now  
 be there. And **D. Dozman** might peradventure lack some  
 of the beastes companions and friends that he hath,  
 vnlesse he would for good companie, accompany them  
 into Bedleem him selfe. And that Preacher, whosoener  
 he was, that intreated vpb that text of **S. Paule** to the  
 Cozinthians, did shewe hym selfe to haue had moze  
 discretion and learninge in his head, than you haue **D.**  
**Dozman**: and also moze truthe in his mouthe, than  
 was in your penne, when you alleaged this terte of  
**S. Paule** for proufe of your proposition, *That the head of  
 the Church, must needs be a Prieste.*

For I beseeche the good Reader, where as **S. Paule**  
 doth describe & set forth the Hierarchie Ecclesiasticall &

D. Hardi  
 Apo. fo. 298. b. &  
 320. b.

Genuinū fran-  
 gere.

1. Cor. 12.  
Ephc. 4.

orders of Ecclesiasticall ministers, in the firste to the  
 Corinthians and also in the Epistle to the Ephesians;  
 if it had bene Goddes ordinaunce (as these men doe say)  
 that of necessitie one Biſtrophe, and of all other the Bi-  
 shop of Rome, should haue bene the onely head of that  
 Hierarchie or whole order Ecclesiasticall, & of the whole  
 Church: is it credible, that S. Paule would haue lefte  
 him out vnnamed, as he hath done in those places: S.  
 Paules wordes to the Corinthians are these. *Et alios*  
*quidē posuit Deus in Ecclesia primū Apostolos.* &c.  
 that is to say: And God hath also ordeined in y<sup>e</sup> Church  
 or congregation, first the Apostles, secondarily Pro-  
 phetes; thirdly teachers, than them that doe miracles,  
 after that the giftes of healing, helpers, gouernours,  
 diuersitie of tongues &c. And to the Ephesians in reas-  
 oning of the same reherſal, of Ecclesiasticall ministers, he  
 hath these wordes: *Et idem dedit, alios quidem A-*  
*postolos.* &c. that is to say: and the very same (Christ)  
 made some Apostles, some Prophetes, some Euange-  
 listes, some Sheperdes or Pastours, & some teachers,  
 that the Sainctes might haue all thinges necessary to  
 worke, and to minister withall, to the edifyinge of the  
 body of Christ, and so forth. Thus farre are S. Paules  
 wordes, wherby he testifieth that he hath named mi-  
 nisters necessarie, to the edifyinge of the body of Christ,  
 whiche is his Church, and to the bringinge of all to vni-  
 tie, which he expreſseth by the similitude of one body, in  
 the whiche he would haue no Schisme. But in these re-  
 herſalles saſeth he any where, that God or Christ orde-  
 ned, or made first Peter, as the head of the Apostles, &  
 of all the Church, and his successours Popes of Rome  
 after him: than the other Apostles, and their succes-  
 sours.

*Multa quidem  
 membra vnum  
 autē corp⁹ &c.  
 mox, vt non sit  
 schisma in cor-  
 pore. &c.*

sours: and so for the.

No surely: he saith not thus, noꝛ to this effect, here, noꝛ no where elles at all. But it had bene moze than necessarie, he shoulde so haue saide **S.** Dozman, had he mente, oꝛ vnderstanded, that such an one onely head (as you woulde haue your Pope to be) had bene so necessarie to the ædifyinge of Chzistes Church, as you woulde haue it seeme that he is: which not to be necessary thereunto, by **S.** Paule reckeninge of necessaries, and omittinge this your head as vnecessary, doth most necessarily folowe. Yea **S.** Paule expzessly sayinge, that God ordeined and made first Apostles, doth declare that the Apostles, and their successours the Bishops, are equally the chiefe: for all the Apostles, and consequently theire successours, are equally by **S.** Paule, first: and none can be befoze the firste. And where these men doe dreame, that this their one head of the whole Church, is moste necessarie for the auoidinge of Schismes, and dissentions, and for vnitie in the Church, marke I pray thee good Reader, how carefull **S.** Paule is for the vnitie of the Church, and what he saithe therefoze in the fourth to the Ephesians, where he hath the same rehersall of Ecclesiasticall ministers, and the same treatie, that he hath here. *Solliciti(inquit)seruare vnitatem spiritus, in vinculo pacis, vnum corpus, & vnus spiritus &c.* Eph. 4. that is to say: be ye carefull to keepe the vnitie of the spirite, in the bonde of peace: one body, one spirite, one hope of your vocation, one Loꝛde, one faith, one baptisme, one God, and Father of all. Thus saith **S.** Paule might not here haue bene added: & one Pope the head of the whole Church, to keepe it in vnitie: surely it might most aptely haue bene added, and shoulde of ne-

cessitie haue bene added, had S. Paule thought y<sup>e</sup> such an  
 head of y<sup>e</sup> whole Church had for y<sup>e</sup> vnitie of the same bene  
 so necessarie, as these men say it is. Wherefoze I conclude  
 y<sup>e</sup> in this treatie, of the vnitie of the Church, no mention  
 being by S. Paule made of any such head as necessarie for  
 the vnitie thereof, noz in the rehearsal of al necessarie mini-  
 sters & officers Ecclesiasticall here, & in that .12. chapter to  
 the Cozinthians by S. Paule made, any mention at all is  
 made of any suche head, S. Paule doth geue vs to vnder-  
 stāde, y<sup>e</sup> he did not know of any such head, so necessarie to y<sup>e</sup>  
 Church, & the vnitie thereof: & y<sup>e</sup> he therefore doth clearly  
 ouerthrow your first false proposition *of the necessitie of one  
 head ouer Christes church here in earth, & withal your second of one  
 head priest,* & so cōsequētly your popes supzremacie, wherfoze  
 neither the preacher, y<sup>e</sup> said he could finde no place, in that  
 place of S. Paule for y<sup>e</sup> Pope, neither y<sup>e</sup> vniuersitie his mo-  
 ther, frō whēce he came, na deth to be ashamed of y<sup>e</sup> sermō,  
 y<sup>e</sup> most faultie place wherof, y<sup>e</sup> you coulde finde, is such, as  
 all Papistes in all their sermons & bookes to, shal neuer be  
 hable truely to proue faultie. And you D. Dozman such a  
 Bachelor of diuinitie, not speaking wordes, which often-  
 times some banish, but writing wordes, longer to endure:  
 & setting thē forth as your owne, knowyng in your con-  
 science how you had borrowed, & where you had borrowed y<sup>e</sup>  
 whole, & sometime by lūpes taking sixe doctours, or eight  
 textes of Scriptures together in order as they lie in your  
 authour, by you so shamefully robbed: & in your entries to  
 y<sup>e</sup> said places, & in your cōclusions of the same, translating  
 wordes for wordes out of your spoiled authour: you I say  
 thus dealinge in writing your selfe, might haue spared to  
 speake of shame or dishonour of an other, for a sentence in  
 a Sermon so longe agoe, & so wel and truely spoken: much  
 moze might you haue spared in your excessive behemēcte,

to

Litera scripta  
 manet.

foal the falde preacher frantique sole, & Bedleem madde man, & in Bedleem to be placed, for saying that he coulde finde no roume in this place of S. Paule for y<sup>e</sup> Pope: which in doede neither he, nor any man liuinge can finde: and you M. Dozmā shal finde farre moze easly a place or two, or thre, for certaine frātique furious Popes in Bedleem, or in the dougen of S. Angels castle worse thā Bedleem, where some of them died like dogges (as their owne histories do testifie) thā you shalbe hable to finde place for any Pope in these places of S. Paule, or in any other places, thzoughout the whole bodie of y<sup>e</sup> scriptures. Vea M. Dozman, I thinke a man shoulde hardly finde any place, not onely for y<sup>e</sup> Pope, but for any one popish prelats or Priest at all in these places of S. Paule. Be your Cardinalles & Bishops, Apostles, or their successours, preachinge, and teaching as thei did: S. Paule saith, doctozs & teachers are necessary: he saith no where, your dombe, idle, proude prelates, are necessary to y<sup>e</sup> adisyng of christes church: be thei Bishops: be they not rather tempozall Lordes & Princes, which to y<sup>e</sup> Apostles & their successours is by Christ, by S. 1. Petr. 5. Peter, by y<sup>e</sup> scriptures, & ouldest Canōs to the forbidden: Math. 20. do your Cardinalles & bishops minister y<sup>e</sup> Sacramentes, Canō. Apost. as they did: or do they not rather sende both preaching & ministeringe of the Sacramentes, as thinges too base for their Lordly state, to lowlye fraters, & poze pelting popish sir Johns: be thei prophets or Euāgelistes: be they teachers or doctozs: do they worke myzacles, cure diseases, haue they y<sup>e</sup> gifte of tōgues: for these be those, whome S. Paule speaketh of. No surely thei be none of all these: for they teache not, they serue not, but spoyle, deuour, & murder the flocke, thei do nothing to adisyng, but to destru-  
ctio of Christes bodie, which is his Church. Surely, as you M. Dozman, do say of Princes, I may truely say of them,

Cardinalis Bēb<sup>s</sup>  
de Iulio. 2.  
Platina de Bo-  
nifacio octauos

1. Petr. 5.  
Math. 20.  
Canō. Apost.

except

except it be this worde, governours, that thei may take houlde of, there is none other place for the in S. Paules reherfall of Ecclesiasticall ministers. But what manner of governours be they, I pray you: suche as S. Paule, suche as S. Peter (vpon whome yet they grounde, and founde all their gouernement) such as Christe our Sauiour, (who forbide to Ecclesiasticall ministers all dominion and worldly gouernment,) do require: no surely, but cleane contrary, vsinge lordly dominion, princely power, tyzannious crueltie ouer the flocke of Christ. Wherefore I do conclude, that here in S. Paule there is no place, not onely for your Pope, but also not for any your popishe Prelates, or Priestes at all. Now where M. Dozman alleageth Caluine for Wisshoppes against Princes, I do meruaile that his brayne serued him (for such phzases it pleaseth him here to vse) to pray aide of an aduersarie, & so extremely hated an aduersarie.

Non quasi dominātes in gre-  
gē.

Math. 20.

Caluinus Instit.  
lib. 4. c. 3. sect. 4.

And where Caluine in the place by M. Dozman here noted, intreateth vpon the fourth to the Ephesians, it is not the parte of a man findinge faulte with other mens old dimme eyes, and bragging of his cleare yonge sight, to alleage him as though he had there intreated vpon the .12. chapter of the first to the Corinthians, for that is the place whiche M. Dozman is here in hande withall. And Caluine in the place of his Institution here by M. Dozman noted, onely reherseth suche Ecclesiasticall gouernours, as haue the peculier offices of preachinge Goddes worde, and ministringe of the Sacramentes, whiche we did neuer attribute to Princes. And there was no cause why, he should place Princes amongst Apostles, Prophetes, Euāgelistes, Pastours, Doctours, for of those onely speaketh Caluine in the  
place

place by *D. Dozman* here alleaged. Wherefoze this declareth that *D. Dozmas* sight was not so cleare, as he maketh it: and especially, the daseling of *D. Dozmanns* eyes, appeareth in that he is so busie with these places of *S. Paule*, and with *Caluines* iudgement vpon the same, who teacheth that in those places not onely no place is to be founde foze his *Pope*, but that these places of all other, do most effectuously ouerthrow the Supremacie of this one head priest the *Pope*. And so whiles *D. Dozman* would gaine hereby against *Princes*, foze the authoritie of *Bishops*, he loseth the Supremacie of his one head *Bishop* the *Pope*, ouer all *Bishops*, and ouer the whole *Church*. And by his owne places selected as well out of the newe Testament, as of the old, vpon earnest studie of prouinge his consequence, that *Princes* can not be the chiefe gouernours in the particular *Churches* of their owne dominions, he quite overthroweth both his first proposition, of the necessitie of one onely head of *Christes Church* here in earth, and also his seconde proposition, That the saide head must needs be a Priest, bringing nothing but that whiche doth indifferently & equally appertaine to all *Priestes*, and therefore not making specially, foze the Supremacie of one ouer all: and so his places by not prouing that, foze the proufe whereof they were brought, but rather the contrarie, do vtterly disproue, and overthrowe it.

1. Cor. 12.  
Eph. 4.

*Dorman. Fol. 19.*

*But if a man should aske this great Clerke that hath so narrowly scanned the texte, what rounge be founde there for kinges: I marvel what his wisdom would answer. There is but one worde in all the texte that should seeme to make place for any temporall ma-*

*R*

*gistrats*

gistrate, and that hath Caluin warred with such a glose, that it can in no wise serue his purpose. The woorde is gubernationes, gouernementes, placed beside so farre from the chiefest and first place, (if it were to be vnderstande of Temporall Magistrates) that it occupieth the ieuenth. But Caluin saith it may not so be vnderstande, but that the Apostle ment by that woord such spirituall men, as were ioyned to the preachers, for the better order in spirituall gouernement. And he addeth a reason, why it may not be vnderstande of Ciuill Magistrates: because (saith he) there were at that time none of them Christians. By whiche woordes this very man maie see, that if he will needes daunce after his maister Caluine his pipe, he muste saie that there is not, not onclie no roume in this place for Ciuile Magistrates, but that he is excluded also from the hope of findinge for them anie, (I meane in the gouernement in Ecclesiasticall causes) in any other place of the newe Testaments.

That ciuill  
magistrate  
should go  
uerne i th  
churche,  
can not be  
proued by  
the newe  
Testamen  
by Caluini  
reason,

Nowell.

This matter is slenderly handled by you M. Doorman, thus to passe ouer this place, and not to shewe vs in what part therof your Pope should be placed: which argueth in drede, that you can here finde no place for him at all: elles woulde you not (I beleue,) haue so dissembled the matter, and sille thronke away. And being not habile here to place, his Pope (as a man moze desirous to strike his aduersarie, than to defende his owne head,) he doth aske what roume may be founde there, for kinges: and proceedeth to proue by Caluine yet once againe, that Princes can haue no place there. M. Doorman may in deepe be as bould to belie Caluine nowe thise, as he hath bene, and is continually, to falsifie the holy Scriptures, and saynges of the ancient doctours. But why haue you not noted vs y place  
where.

where Caluine so saith, the place before noted hath no  
 suche thinge, as I haue declared. But you knowinge  
 that Caluine by this place of the Cozinthians, and the  
 4. to the Ephesians, euery where proueth that the Popes  
 Supremacie is a vaine forged lie, naming Caluine  
 as against vs, and therupon makinge your discourses  
 and marginall notes, durst not note the places, lest they  
 should be founde to make with vs, against you. I will  
 shewe the place which I thinke you doe meane. Caluine  
 in his Institution the fourth booke. ii. chapter and firste  
 section vpon the woorde gubernationes, in the. 12. chap-  
 ter of the first to the Cozinthians, here by M. Dozman  
 alleaged, and vpon this in the. 12. to the Romaines.  
 Qui præst. &c. Let him that ruleth rule with careful-  
 nes, hath the like woordes, as are by M. Dozman here  
 reherfed, after this sorte. Non enim alloquitur Magis-  
 tratus, qui nulli tunc erant Christiani. &c. that is to  
 saie. For he speaketh not to Magistrates, of whom none  
 were than Christened &c. by which woordes of Caluine,  
 as it may seme, M. Dozman would gather that there  
 is no roome for ciuil Magistrates, not only in this place  
 of the Cozinthians, by his iudgement, but that he ex-  
 cludeth vs from hope of findinge for them any place of  
 gouernemēt in Ecclesiastical causes, in any other place  
 of the new Testamēt. Which in deede neither Caluine  
 saith here, neither can be gathered of him, by this, or  
 any other place in him, that I haue redde. In this same  
 booke of his Institutio, Caluine expounding y same woord  
 gubernationes, gouernmēt (in this very place of S. Pauls  
 epistle to y Coz. by M. Doz. here noted) hath these woordes  
*Tamesi eni. &c.* y is to say. Although S. Paule doe proper-  
 ly speake of y counsell or cōpany of graue mē, who in the

Lib. 4. cap. 20.  
 sect. 4.

primitive Church were appointed to be overseers in the ordering of publique discipline, the whiche office in his Epistle to the Corinthians, he calleth Gubernationes, gouvernementes: yet because we doe see the ende of the Civill Magistrate, to tend to the same pointe or effect, there is no doubt, but that S. Paule doth thereby commend to vs all kinde or sortes of iuste government. Thus saith Caluine: whereby you may see that Caluine doth not onely say, that civill Magistrates are commended to vs, by this very word, Gubernationes, gouvernementes, whiche M. Dozman denieth, but also affirmeth that the office of the godly Magistrate tendeth to the same ende, that is to the maintenaunce and oversight, of publique discipline in the Church, (for of that he here speaketh) whiche these men doe denie.

Finem ciuilis potestatis code recidere.

Calui. li. 4. ca. 11. sect. 1. & cap. 20. sect. 4. 1. Cor. 12. Gubernationes.

Rom. 12. Qui praest in solitudine profit.

Ibidem.

Dij nūcupātur, Mandatū a Deo habent, diuina autoritate praediti sunt. oīo Dei personā sustinēt, cuius vices quodāmodo agunt. Ibidē. sect. 6. Se Dei Vicarios esse meminerint. Item sect. 9. Dei Vicarij sunt. &c. Itē in. 7. c. Osee 2. 81.

Wherefore M. Dozman, though Caluine say that S. Paule in that place, and in the. 12. to the Romanes, did not speake to Magistrates, who than were not Christianed, yet doth he not exempte Christian Magistrates. When God did after sende them, by this place: but rather confesseth that S. Paule dothe by this place commend them to vs, beinge the beste kinde of iust gouernours: and whose office saith Caluine, tendeth to the same ende of the orderinge of publike discipline in the Church. Yea, and Caluine saith, that the Magistrate (and especially the Godly,) is Gods Vicar: whiche title these men can suffer in no wyse to be geuen to any, sauing onely their Romishe Pope. He affirmeth that the state of the Church is by God committed to the protection and protection of Princes: that the office of Magistrates extendeth it selfe to bothe the tables: that the Magistrates ought to take vpon them the care of Religion,

gion, to restore it decayed, or fallen downe: and that they are in Goddes place ordeined not onely to decide worldly controuersies, but also to see that God be purely worshipped, according as is appointed in his lawe: for that they be ordeined to be the protectours, and maintainers as well of true Religion, as of publique peace and honestie. Thus saith Caluine, with much more to be said hereafter, where M. Doorman laeth him yet againe to our charge, as dissenting from vs. But hereby it is euident, that Caluine doth agree with vs in these pointes, and that M. Doorman alleaginge him as charging vs, that we do goe about to make Princes insle with God, and as excluding vs from the hope of findinge any place, either in this Epistle of S. Paule to the Corinthians, or els where in the newe Testament for Christian Princes gouernement in cases Ecclesiasticall, and as directly contrary to vs: doeth pipe a lie, & daunce awzie. For if M. Doorman will daunce after Caluins pipe, he must both confesse with vs that his Popes supzremacie is, by this very place of S. Paule to the Cozinthians, here by him selfe alleaged, cleane ouerthrowen: and also that Christian Princes, as Gods vicars, haue to do in Ecclesiasticall causes, and with refozation of Religion. This and much more must he confesse I say, if he will daunce after Caluines pipe. Whiche phrase I vse, for that it pleaseth this merie man here to vse this metaphor of pipinge, and dauncinge after a pipe: as he did before Dormã. fol. 17: a1  
 soze as leudly vse the like of strikinge vpon a wronge stringe, and is vsually in hande with like minstrellike phrases, and folishe termes, vled againste vs in suche places, as he him selfe, like a blinde harper, and lewde piper, striketh most awzie, and whistleth moste leudlie. And for that I haue lustly reyzoned, and derided the  
 P 3. notable

notable foolishnes thereof, in such sorte, as it deserved, a sorte of popishe rimers haue therefore railed vppon me, and M. Dozman also chargeth me, as though I had geuen the firste occasion of suche lewde minstrelse. But they do wel now all reason faileth them, to supplie that defecte by railinge riminge, as most meete for them, and suche matiers as they haue in hande: least they should altogether seeme destitute of all both rime and reason.

Caluine in dede taketh from Princes the office of preaching, of excommunicating, or binding & loosing, and of ministering the Sacramentes, and geueth all this to the Ecclesiasticall ministers: and so do we also, and do professe as doth Caluine, that y<sup>e</sup> Prince him selfe ought to be obedient to the Ecclesiasticall minister executinge these his offices according to Gods worde: yea though it be against the Prince him selfe, accordinge as Theodosius the Emperour was in this case obedient to S. Ambrose. But let M. Dozman show where Caluine denieth vnto Christian, princes authoritie to reprove, correct, or punish Ecclesiasticall persons slacke in their offices, manifestly swaruing from Goddes worde, or otherwise offenders to summon or call the to Synodes within their owne dominions: to be present, and president if they list, at their treaties, and to establish such orders, or ordinaunces as do appertaine to the outwarde regiment, and policie of the Church within their owne dominions. For this must M. Dozman do, if he will proue Caluine to be at square with vs. But the vsage of the Magistrates of Geneva (where Caluine was) by whose authoritie Religion was reformed, and Caluine him selfe euery where do stande clearly with vs. Pet  
hath

hath M. Dozman intermingled in this place one subteltie, not to be ouerpasse: the worde Gubernationes governementes, saithe M. Dozman, is placed so farre from the chiefest and firste place, occupieng the sequent, that it can not make for any chiefe rounge that Princes shoulde haue in Ecclesiasticall regiment.

I will not here trouble M. Dozma with Erasmus translation, who hath translated this worde *Δυναμεις* potestates, powers, whiche is in the fourth place, and whiche worde, as it seemeth, may be vnderstanded of Princes well enough, to bringe Princes more forward here. But I will put M. Dozman in remembrance, that Princes were not than Chzistened (as he for his vantage hath befoze out of Caluine noted) and that therefore he doth inconueniently, to seeke the chiefe place in the Church for them, whiche than had there no place, beyng Heathen men: whiche yet maketh nothinge against Christian Princes, to whome I doe trust M. Dozman will not denie a place in Chzistes Church: though he might by as good reason not suffer Christian Princes to haue any place at all in Chzistes Church for that Heathen Princes had none: as he will not suffre Christian Princes to haue any rule or gouernement in Chzistes Church, for that Heathen Princes there had none: for there is like reason in bothe. Nowe seeinge M. Dozman thinketh it reason, that suche order in rehersall, shoulde proue who be the chiefe in dignitie, and who inferiours, it were well that he woulde receiue the same reason himselfe: and eyther to finde, or vtterly to loose his one heade of the Church the Pope. For bothe in this place, and likewise in the fourth to the Ephesians,

S. Paule

S. Paule saith, that God ordeined and made firste, not one Apostle, or Peter, but Apostles, that is al the Apostles to be equally the first and chiefe, every one in his charge: and not one (Peter) to be the firste, and ouer all the other Apostles (as the Papistes do dreame) wherefoze by M. Dozman his reason of order in reherfall, seeinge his Pope, or any other man for him, hath not here the firste and chiefe place in order of reherfall, he is not the chiefe aboute all others in dignitie, and authoritie. And it were meete also, that M. Dozman should not refuse the same reason of prouinge y<sup>e</sup> chiefe in dignitie, by suche orde of reherfall in other places, specially suche places, as be by him selfe alleaged, as namely, in y<sup>e</sup> Prophete Aggeus his first and seconde chapters: where reherfall beyng made ioinally fise times of Zorobabel the Duke or Prince, and Iesus the high Priest, the Prince hath the chiefe place, and the high Priest the second continually, and the people the thirde (as I haue befoze noted) whiche place by M. Dozmanns reason, proueth the Prince to haue the chiefe and highest dignitie, and the high Priest the second. Yea it is greater reason that such orde in the prophete Aggeus should proue the Prince the high Priest his superiour, than that S. Paules reherfall should proue Princes inferiour to priestes in the church of God: for that in S. Paules time Princes were Heathen, Pagans, and Idolatours esttraunged from the Church of Christe, yea moztall enemies thereunto, and therefore no maruaile if S. Paule in his reherfall of the officers appertaininge to the buildinge of Christes Church, had litle regarde or respect to Pagane princes, who were none of the saide Church, neither builders, but pullers dotone thereof. Whiche can make no reason  
against

Agg. 1. & 2.

against Christian Princes, the builders of the Church: vnlesse D. Dozman thinke it reason, because Heathen Princes had no place in Christes Church in S. Pauls time, that Christian Princes shoulde therefore haue no place in Christes Church in our time (as I haue before noted) which if it do not folow, (as in dede it doth not) why shoulde it moze folowe, that Christian Princes haue no authozitie in the gouernement of Christes Church, because Heathen Princes had no authozitie in the gouerninge of Christes Church: But let vs seeke for the due places of Princes and prestles in Gods Church, not whereas the one had no place (which is not reason) but where both the Prince and the Priestle had their places, that is, where both were godly. As in the prophete Aggeus his time, the Prince was godly, and of the Church, as well as the high Priest: the matier the prophete speaketh of, is the Lozdes worke, and buildinge of the Lozdes temple, and Church, by expresse wordes: and in the saide buildinge of Goddes temple, the Prophete beinge directed by Goddes spirite, dothe five times together place the Prince aboue or before y high Priest. Likewise in Solomons time the Prince and Priestle beinge bothe godly, and therefore both hauinge place in Goddes Church, the Scripture saith: Time Dominum fili mi, & Regem, feare God my childe, and the kinge: placinge the kinge nexte vnto God, as nerest in authozitie, without any comminge betwene of the Priest. Wherefore this order of placinge the Prince before the highe Priest in a rehersall, saincly and expressely made of the Prince & high Priest together, and that so often times also, they both beyng godly, and of the Church, yea and in Gods workes to,

Prouerb. 24.

D

and

and building of his temple, declared by the prophet Ag-  
geus by your selfe allcaged, & this placinge of the godly  
Princke next vnto God, as next him in dignitie, in other  
places of the Scriptures, do by your owne reason M.  
Dorinan, proue the superiortie of the godly Princke a-  
boue the high Priest, and al Priestes. And the omitting  
of vngodly and Heathen Princes in S. Paules rehersal  
of Ecclesiasticall governours, doth nothing hinder the  
dignitie of godly and Christian Princes, as you with-  
out all rime or reason, woulde reason. And as you haue  
herein piped like your selfe M. Dorinan, so should he  
that would daunce after your pipe: daunce like a foole.

*Dorinan Fol. 19.*

*But not in this place onely was S. Paule of that minde; that  
Priestles should gouerne the Church of Christe. but in that notable  
sermon of his also, that he made to the Priestes of Ephesus at his  
departme from thence, where he giueth them this exhortation.*

Translated out  
of Hosius, woord  
for vwoorde,  
fol. 35. b. & 38. a

*Auendite vobis & vniuerso gregi, in quo vos spiritus san-  
ctus posuit episcopus, regere ecclesiam dei. Looke saith he to  
your selues, and to your flocke in the whiche the holy ghost hath pla-  
ced you to rule, and gouerne the Church of God.*

Actus. 50

*Can there be any plainer euidence then is this? Let them there-  
fore either rule (as S. Paule saith they are appointed thereto, and  
that by the holie ghost) or if Princes must, let vs deny saint Paule  
his auctoritie, and say that the spirite failed him, for surely bothe  
may not.*

*Nowell.*

*S. Paule is euery where of one minde, but no where  
of your minde M. Dorinan. You and Cardinall Hosius  
be of one minde, who do so iumpe agrée together, that  
scmetime you alleage a great many of doctours (as a li-  
tle befoze you did and hereafter often do) sometime, a  
great*

great many moe Scriptures (as here in this present place) together in the same order one after an other, and that with so like or rather the same handling & circumstances that you & he must needs be of one minde. The whole force of your Hosian argument standeth in this worde Regere, which you, by amplificatio do translate, to rule & governe the Church: but the originall worde in the Greeke is ποιμαίνειν, y is, to governe, & fede as a sheparde doth his sheepe. And 1. Petri. 5. the same worde is translated, Pascite, fede the flocke. And immediatly after S. Peter forbiddeth them to exercise dominion or lordship over the flocke: whereby y chiefe soueraigntie, that M. Dozman by this worde thinketh to be geuen to Priestes, & specially that princely or imperiall lordship of the Pope over y flocke, is excluded, seeing they be not lordes over the flocke. ποιμαίνειν therefore, Regere, vel pascere: signifieth to guide, fede, cherish and defend the flocke. For by and by he maketh mention of raueninge wolues, which would inuade the flocke, fro the whiche, the shepardes ought to defende them. But our popishe prelates (how so euer they haue cloked them selves) haue by their fruites & deedes (whereby they are to be knowe) shewed the selves, not y shepardes, but those raueninge wolues, of whome S. Paule there soreshewed, & gaue warning. Now if we will graunt, as M. Dozman would haue it, and as he saithe expressly hereafter, that the whole gouernment, & chiefe soueraigntie in the Church is in this worde Regere, to rule or governe, geuen to Priestes: doth it not than solowe, that all they, to whome S. Paule speaketh this worde, as also all they, to whome S. Peter speaketh y same (of the which none was Bishoppe of Rome) had this whole gouernement,

1. Petr. 5.  
Neque ceu do-  
minium exercē-  
tes aduersus cle-  
ros, &c.

and chiefe soueraigntie geuen them thereby, and so that either the Bishop of Rome hath it not, or if he haue it; that he hath it common & æquall with other Bishops: and where is his supzremacie than, if other also haue the whole gouernement, and chiefe soueraigntie: which either let M. Dozman graunt, or els geue ouer this his leude reason, grounded vpo the woꝛde Regere, to rule, or gouerne: as though the whole gouernment & chiefe soueraigntie were thereby ment, & therein-contained.

Further emongst al those, to whom S. Paule spake these woꝛdes: *Looke to your selues and to all the flocke, in the which the holy ghost hath placed you, to rule the church: there was not one such priest, as be y popish priestes, now a daies: who loke neither to them selues, except it be to eate, drinke, sleepe, and play, noz attende to the flocke, but to spoile, & murther: so that no one woꝛde of that tert can appertaine to them, vnlesse mindelesse muling of their mattins & masses be sèding: and spoiling, persecutynge, murthering, & deuouringe, be gouerninge of the flocke. For what other sèding or gouerning hath the Pope, & his swoꝛne Cleargie, of lōge time bled: but such gouernours I am sure, were neuer placed by y holy ghost, in Chzistes church. How be it, that godly Bishops, & other Ecclesiasticall ministers (such as S. Paule in this place spake vnto) by preaching of Gods woꝛde, rebuking, re- prouinge, excommunicatinge also (whan hēde shall so require,) may gouerne, and rule as well the Prince, as the people, we neuer denied. Neither will we sticke to graunt that the Prince his scholemaster in his office, doth rule, and ought to rule the Prince, and in that respect is aboue him also: for the maister is aboue the scholar, as he is a scholar, I am sure. Powe as we are contented.*

contented to graunte that the Prince ought to heare a Bishop truly preaching, humble to receiue the Sacramentes at his hande, duely administring the same, patiently to heare his vices reprehended of the Bishop by Gods worde, yea and being excommunicate vpon iust cause, to submitte him selfe also to the Bishop, as Gods minister in that behalfe, but further the Bishop may not proceade, as to depriue the Prince from his office, and to place an other in his steade, or to vse suche rule as the Popes, those false vsurpers, haue of longe and to longe done: so let M. Dozman, and other Romanistes graunt to vs, that the Prince may correcte, punish, and depose Bishoppes, and other Ecclesiasticall ministers being negligent, offendours, or incorrigible, according to the qualitie and quantitie of their crime: and that the Prince may sommon them to Synoddes or counsels, vse his authoritie as chiefe in ordering the assembled, and in authorising and establishing of outward orders for the gouernement of the Church: or let him and them proue the contrary. For hitherto he hath onely proued that Prelstes ought to haue suche kynde of rule and gouernement, as no man denieth them. His euidence therfore is nothing so plaine and certen as he maketh it. For where he saith, *that we must confesse that Bishops must either rule (as S. Paule saith) or be ruled, and so that the spirit falled S. Paule herein, for suretie saith he, both may not.* Surely M. Dozman I had thought, that the Coucell might rule a good Prince, by their wisdome: and the Judge of y<sup>e</sup> Realme, by aduertisemēt of the Lawes: and his Physicians in his sickness, might rule him by hollesome physike: and his Scholemaster might rule him by instructions: and that the maister of a Shippe, ther

of named in latine gubernator, may gubernare oꝛ re-  
gere, (to vse the very terme, foꝛ all is one) gouerne oꝛ  
rule, and by good governing may saue both the shippe,  
and the Prince also sailinge therein: and that yet the  
Prince might rule them all by his authoritie, and that  
theresore to rule and be ruled, thinges whiche you as-  
sume surely may not both be, might surely in diuers re-  
spectes oꝛ comparisons both be well enough.

*Dorman. Folio. 19.*

And thus for the Scriptures (good readers) ye see, to whom of right  
that part of Ecclesiastical gouernement, whiche standeth in the al-  
lowing and condemning of doctrine doth appertaine. For that doo the  
authorities by me out of the old Testament alleaged, expressely proue  
as also doo those brought out of the newe, by a necessarie consequēce,  
in that they giue to them the whole gouernment and chiefe soverei-  
tie, of whiche this is, as is before saide, a parte.

*Nowell.*

Thus you see good Readers, that the Scriptures al-  
leaged by M. Dorman out of Hosius, & first those of the  
olde Testament, appertaine nothing to his purpose: as  
those whiche partlie intreate of discerninge bet weene  
thinges cleane & vncleane, as meates, drinckes, beastes,  
fowles, fishes, offerings, diseases, pꝛiue murders, and  
other like ceremoniall matters, nowe either cleane ab-  
olished amongst Christians, oꝛ if any remayne in vse,  
yet not appertaining to y<sup>e</sup> office of pꝛiestes (besides that  
much matter in the procelle of the said Scriptures con-  
tained, is directly against many Popishe ceremonies, &  
superstitions nowe vbled) and partly the said textes proue  
such thinges, as we neuer denied: as that pꝛiestes ought  
to haue

to have vnderstanding in the Scriptures, thereby to instructe the people, and to resolue them of their doubttes, according to God his woorde and commaundementes: whiche doth in deede apperteyne directly to the ministrie of the woorde, or office of preaching, whiche is with *M. Dorman* the thirde part of his diuision, and for the whiche him selfe confesseth, we doe not strue with him neither make any quarell: and therefore he hath bene well occupied about the prouinge of that, whiche no man denied: and he also kepeth a good methode in prouing his thirde part in the treatie of the first. To conclude therefore for this parte, ye see good Readers, how vntruly & fondly *M. Dormā* saith, *That the autorities of the olde Testament by him alleaged, doo expresselie proue, to whom she allowinge and condemning of doctrine doth apperteyne: meaning that it should apperteyne to prestes onely, where as those authorities intreate moze, what knowledge to iudge and teache they should haue, than, what authoritie or power in iudging they haue. For surely to whom soeuer it apperteyneth, to iudge of doctrine, they stande bounden to haue knowledge in Goddes woorde, and to deale according to the same. Wherefoze it can in no wise apperteyne to the Pope, and Papisles, who are partly ignoraunt, and whollie the corrupters thereof. Howe his places out of the newe Testament be such, that they haue not one woorde in them, of, nor for the iudging of the doctrine, whiche is soude whiche is oter. which is the first part of his diuision, and by him vndertaken to be proued by these places of the Scriptures: wherefoze that he saith, he hath proued by those textes that Priestes ought to haue the whole gouernement and chiefe sonerainie is very ridiculous.*

Dorm. fol. 20. 2.

For

For if he would thus proue the whole at once, what needd that solemne tripartite diuision so lately made, as though he would procede to proue the partes in order: Was it made more to show his conning in dialecticall diuision; than of any neede of the matter, seying suddenly by one woorde <sup>from it</sup> proued at at once? But seing it is euident that those partes of the newe Testament doe apperteyne nothing at all to his Popishe Brelates and Priestes, as those to whome neither the names, nor functions of Ecclesiasticall officers, by S. Paule reherced, doe, or can by any meanes agree; (as hath at large beene befoze declared) & where as the woord *ποιμνίαν*, (whereupon M. Dozman groundeth his prouise laste) with S. Peter (by whome the Pope doth clayme al his superiortie & soueraigntie) is nothing els but pascere, to feade the flocke, the whiche S. Peter doth also with all expresselie forbidde dominion to all Ecclesiasticall persons; and confesseth him selfe equall or felowe minister and elder with others, M. Dozman may be ashamed vpon that woord, as vpon good ground, to affirme that the chiefe soueraigntie doth apperteyne to priestes: where as the woord soueraigntie doth specially in dede apperteyne to Princes, who, and not Priestes, are called soueraignes: and to whom, as to Priestes, dominion is not forbidden. Further *what whole government and chief soueraigntie soeuer*, M. Dozman hath hitherto declared (as he thinketh) to pertyne to Priestes, it is by the very wordes of his textes euident, that the same equally doth apperteyne, firste to all the Apostles; and their successors equallie, and not to one onelie head specially and principally. And this woorde *Regerè*, to gouerne, (by the whiche woorde M. Dozman saith the whole government

1. Petr. 5.

Pascite quatum  
in vobis est, gre-  
gem Christi &c.  
neque ceu domi-  
nium exercen-  
tes, &c.

συμπεροβύς  
τερος. i. Conse-  
nior.

nement and chiefe soueraigntie (is signified) is not here spoken to, nor of Peter, or the Pope of Rome, but to other, that is, to the Cleargie of Ephesus, so that it is commane and indifferent to all Bishoppes, and ministers Ecclesiasticall, and not peculiar to one onely head Bishop. And so M. Dozmā, whyles he strueth to proue that Princes haue nothinge to do in Christes Church, hath by his diligence, cleane ouerthrowen and made at once, as well al his first matter of the necessitie of one onelie chiefe head in the Church, as also his second and present proposition, of one head Priest, and finally his thirde treatie of the Pope, to be that one head: faring herein (as me thinke) like one playng vnskillfully, with a weapon called the Hurlbatte, who whē he went about to strike his aduersarie with the foze ende thereof, did with the hinder ende vnwares, knocke him selfe in the noddle behinde, and also with the rebounde of the fozmar baullet, breke both his shinnes.

Howe it remaineth that we examine, howe these authorittes, brought by M. Dozmā out of the scriptures of the oulde Testament and the newe, do conclude and proue his present proposition, whiche is this. *That the head of Christes Church here in earth, must needes be a Priest.* First saith M. Dozman. *It is written in Leuiticum cap. 10. Præceptum sempiternum est in generationes vestras, vt habeatis scientiam discernendi inter sanctum & prophanum, inter pollutum & immundum, doceatisque filios Israel omnia legitima mea: That is to saie, it is a precept that I shall euer endure through all your generations, to haue the knowledge to discern and put difference betwene holie thinges and prophane, betwene cleane and polluted: and that you teache the children of Israel all my commaundements.* Ergo, the head of Christes Church here in earth, must needes be a Priest. This is a pectie  
 ¶ argument.

Dorm. fol. 18, 27

argument. For this text proueth neither head nor soke, but sheweth y<sup>e</sup> office of all the Leuites. or In the cleargie. Whiche yet if it did proue any headship, it did subuert *M. Dozmas* first proposition of one head of *Christes* Church, seeing all that is here spoken, pertaineth to all the Leuites or In the Cleargie, as *M. Dozman* him self confesseth by these wordes: To whom gaue almightie God here the power to iudge of doctrine? whom commaunded he to teache any other than Aaron and his race which were Priests? If you saye true *M. Dozman*, than mend your proposition, so as this text proueth after this sort. That al priests haue power to iudge of doctrine, & to teache the people, & than teache vs I pray you, what this text maketh for one priest to be head. Again saith *M. Dozman*. In the Booke of Deuter. saith he not also. that if there arise any hard or doubtful question, the priest must be consulted, and that he that of pride wil spurne against his ordinance shall suffer death therfore. Ergo the head of the whole Church here in earth must needs be a priest. As though, bicause one chief priest may resolue y<sup>e</sup> doubtles rising in one nation of y<sup>e</sup> Iues, one chiefe priest may in likewise resolue all the doubtles rising throughout y<sup>e</sup> whole world. Which reason of his, *M. Dozma* hath liked so wel, that he hath now vpon this text reherced it five times, at the least: and I haue been dntuen so often to answer it. Yea vpon this one woorthie collection, it adeth his whole first treatie of the necessitie of one head of *Christes* whole Church here in earth. The good Reader that list, may see a full answer to his abusing of this text fol. 59. 3c. in my former treatie. Again, saith *M. Dozma* in the same booke in an other place (it is said) that vpon the priestes woorde. or woorde of the priestes, all causes shall hang. Ergo the head of the whole Church in earth must needs be a Priest. Why *M. Dozman* this concludeth not, for the  
place

Dorm. fol. 18. a.

Fol. 18. a. ca. 17.

Deut. 27.  
Ad verbū sacer-  
dotum,

place speaketh of all and euery Prieste Leuiticall, and therefore it can make nothings for your one head. Again it is a matter of secret and vnknown murder specially, whiche that place sheweth, must hange vpon the Priestes woorde, whiche nowe hangeth chiefly vpon the Crowners woorde. Wherefore if that place make for any head of the Church at all, it declareth, that the Crowner should be that head. Again saith

**D. Dorman.** *Ezechiel the Prophet doth he not witnes the same? and when there is anie controuersie (saith he) they shall stae in my iudgements and geue iudgement. Aggeus and Malachias, doo they not bidde vs enquire for the Lawe of God at the Priestes bandes? whose lippes they promesse, shall not misse to keepe the true knowledge because they are our lordes Angelles. Ergo the head of the Church must needes be a Priest.* In all these argumentes

Fol. 18. b. ca. 44.

Aggeus. 2.  
Malach. 2.

I graunt there be two extremes, but euery one of them lacketh a *debitum medium*, and I beleue they are so farre a sunder, that two or thre *media* will scarcely bringe them together. For al these textes doo speake indifferently of all priestes, and their lippes, and therefore proue no one to be the onely head of the Church, but that all ought to be able, & ready to teache in the church: which as we doo graunt, so doth it reprove the Ignorant Asses, and Dombe dogges, the Popishe priestes. Further there is an vntrueth **D. Dormā**, where you say the Prophetes promise that the priestes lippes shall not misse to keepe the true knowledge, for y same Prophets, & in the same places, doo declare y the priestes lips, & heads to, had lost al knowledge. Wherefore thei make no promise in that place, what their lippes shal doo, but shoue what their lips ought to doo: farre other wise suerly, thā thei did, or than your popishe asses lips haue of lōg tīme done: and therefore y place reproveth your lips as well as theirs.

Hosius hath  
Labia custodiūt.

And thus you see good Readers, that these textes of the ould Testament do declare the dutties of al priestes, in knowledge, and teaching of the people (whiche we denie not, but we do wishe they had, and did the same accordingly) & that in al those textes by M. Dozman alleged, is not as much as one woꝝd soundig towardea the pꝛoufe of his proposition, that *one Prieste shoulde be the onelie head of Christes whole Church here in earth.* These be his argumentes out of the ould Testament. Poꝛwe out of the newe Testament he reasoneth thus: *s. Paule declareth that Christ ordeined and made for the gouernaunce of his Church, first Apostles (that is al the Apostles equally to gouerne in the Church, and likewise their successours after them.) Ergo, the onely head of the Church must be a Priest, whiche is as good an argument, as if one should thus reason. All the Senatours must rule equally, Ergo one must rule ouer all. Againe s. Paule said to the elders or Priestes of Ephesus, a citie in Asia, Attendite vobis &c. Looke to your selues and to your flocke, in the whiche the holy ghest hath placed you to rule, and gouerne the Church of God. Ergo the head of the Church must be some one Priest, and consequently the Bis hop of Rome, which is like, as if one wold read thus: The Senatoꝛs of Frankesord, must loke to the gouernement of these citie: Ergo the Lâtgraue of Hesse must loke to the gouernment of all Germany, or rather of all the woꝛldes: so we should make it like to M. Dozmans argumēt. And it is as reasonable almost, of that which was spoken by s. Paule indifferētly to al the elders or Priestes of Ephesus a citie in Asia, to gather a speciall pꝛeeminence of one head pꝛiest of Rome in Italy: as if one should saie, it is fire, Ergo, it is water. Seing therfoꝛe M. Dozman, that neuer an one of these, noꝛ all these pꝛouces*

pꝛoufes together, do pꝛoue your pꝛopositio, *that the head  
 of Christs Church here in earth must needes be a Prieste.* What  
 doth such a pꝛoposition standinge so staringly in great  
 letters, in y<sup>e</sup> first face of your booke: soz thame mā, if you  
 haue any face at al, blotte out, either your pꝛopositio, oz  
 your pꝛoufes: oz (which is best & most mete for the) send  
 them both to the donghill together. For that, whiche in  
 dede these Scriptures do pꝛoue, and teache, touching  
 the office and duetie of Priestes, we neuer denied, but  
 do, and euer did most gladly admitte and receiue. And  
 thus good Reader thou seest howe M. Dozman hath in  
 parte substantiallylly perfozmed this his pꝛomisse. I shall  
 truely bringe foorth, as it were into the face of open Court, all such  
 euidence of importaunce, as either parte hath to alleage for him, and  
 that so truely I trust, that the counsell of the other side shall haue no  
 cause to complaine &c. This godly and well framed pꝛo-  
 messe, set foꝛth with these and other lawlike termes at  
 large, hath M. Dozman for the Scriptures very well  
 perfozmed, bringinge foꝛth al euidence of importaunce  
 in the Scriptures for their parte to be founde, that is  
 to say: bringyng foꝛth out of one place of Hosius, eight  
 places of the Scriptures (& moze would haue brought,  
 had he founde moze there) in god ordꝛe, and aray, as the  
 there stande, with like ingresse and outgresse, to and fro  
 the saide textes, worde for worde with Hosius. Which  
 trade here vsed in the Scriptures, he will not faile, but  
 like a constant man, will continue the same in hand-  
 linge of the doctours, and Histories Ecclesiasticall, in  
 this whole treatie, euen as Hosius doth, and no other  
 wise, for feare of stumlinge. And as here of the Scrip-  
 tures, so of his Hosian handlinge of the doctours, hath he  
 alreadye giuen you a taste, bringyng foꝛth in a ranke

Dormā, fol. 17. b.

Dorman *supra*  
fol. 16. b.

five doctours, in the same ordre, places, & very wordes, as doth Hosius: whome he likewise soloweth throughout this whole proccesse. And yet disdaineth he to be called a translatour, and will needes be accompted an author of this treatie.

Dorman Fol. 19.

The nexte membre of spirituall gouernement, is the power as Christ himselfe calleth it of binding and loosing. Vvhiche power to excommunicate and to absolue our sauour gaue to his Apostles, *Matth. 19.* when he sayed to them: what so euer you binde in earth I halbe bounde in heauen, and what so euer you loose on the earthe I shall be loosed in Heauen. Vvherein and in the last whiche is to preache and ministre the sacramentes, because these peuis he proctours presende not as yet any greate title for Princes, but seeme rather to grounde their action in the first: I will leauing the both as either by the scriptures in all mennes iudgements sufficiently defended, or by our aduersaries themselues not assaulted, examine of what minde touchinge this controuersie, the holy doctours of Christes Church from time to time haue byn. Not as though mannes woordes shoulde haue with vs more auctoritie then Goddes, or that it needeth to be bouldred vp therewith, but for this cause onely, that if it happen them to wrangle, as their manner is, about the true interpretation thereof, all men may perceiue that we giue no other, then the Fathers of Christes Church before vs haue giuen.

Nowell.

**D**orman vseth a maruailous methode. First he deuideth the whole Iurisdiction Ecclesiasticall into its partes, than he promiseth he wil orderly proccede. Than by the oulde Testament he goeth about to proue his first parte. And by and by, by the new Testament he proueth

proueeth as he saith, the whole Jurisdiction to appertaine to Priests. Than he maketh a shewe as though he would proue the seconde parte: and with that by and by, for his ease, he geueth cleane ouer both the seconde and thirde parte, that is two of the thre, as to the which the peeuish procters, as he saith, doe pretende no great title.

Why sir, but where is the authoritie of makinge of rules and lawes, for the gouernement of the Church become? which is a parte of your diuision, & no doubt pertaineth specially to your deuided Jurisdiction, and in the which standeth the chiefe controuersie betwene vs (for we say that

Christian Princes haue chiefly to doe therewith) where

is it now become I pray you, that you here in this seconde rehersall of the partes of your diuision passe it ouer with silence, or rather caste it cleane away with the y. last partes, betwene the whiche you had so doubtfully placed it: It was for naught, that where there were in

deede foure partes or pointes in your diuision, that you woulde yet haue no moze but thre: and the authoritie of

makinge rules and lawes for the gouernement of the Church, which is in deede the chiefe point in controuersie, you placed and pointed so doubtfully, that it were too much a doe to finde to which of the thre it appertained. For now lo

it is cleane shonke in the wetinge, and is become no pointe, neither parte of any pointe at all, but is cleane cast away with the two last partes, betwene the which it was so doubtfully placed. But saith M. Dozman he

hath omitted it, for that these peeuish procters make no great title for Princes therein: where as in deede our chiefe title & controuersie with the is there aboute. Now truly M.

Dozman you plaid the peeuish proctour in so saying, & bringing your solemne tripartite diuision of Jurisdiction

Justinian the  
Emperour hath  
made so many  
lawes Ecclesi-  
asticall, that  
were they all  
ioined together  
they woulde  
make a great  
volume.

Ecclesi

Dorman *supra*  
fol. 17. a.

Ecclesiasticall to this poynce. I pray the god Reader call to remembrance his wordes befoze about his diuision, howe he will bringe all the euidence of importaunce that bothe partes haue tof howe for them, that he will neither suppress; conceile. nor obscure any thinge, that like an vpright iudge he will haue an earnest eye to the issue, that he will so conferre the euidence with every poynct, that it may appeare whether it agree with any parte, with none, with some, or with whiche: that at the length by good scanning we may come to the knowledge of every mans owne. These be M. Dorman's owne wordes: and yet vpon so glorious and lawlike a pꝛeface & promise, in the pꝛocesse forgettinge his issue, and both what is his owne and other mens euidence to, leaueth out almoste all of obliuion, or of purpose conceileth it, confoundeth, mingleth, and iumbleth al together, so obscuringe all matters, that no man can come to the knowledge of his owne. This if thou wilt well compare together god Reader, thou shalt truely finde him, the same whiche he without cause objecteth to vs, a pꝛeuiſhe popiſh pꝛocter, pꝛating without al rime or reason he woteth not what, and by such handlinge of his matters, truely making vs an hotchpot, to vse his owne terme. And thus in dede it must nedes happen to those, who spending their studie and time in lawe matters, will sodainely become Bachelers of diuinitie. But as it is saide, it were better to be a good yoman, than a beggerly Gentleman. Now whereas M. Dorman confesseth that he will not allege the doctours after the Scriptures, as though mans worde should haue with them more authoritie than Goddes, or that it needed to be bolstered vp therewith, this saying hath the better grace, if it be remembred how strongly he hath befoze fortified his matter by the Scriptures. And I woulde

god Reader, thou wouldest compare this sayinge with **M. Doz**mans doinges and handlinge of other matiers, as the proufe of his firste proposition *of the necessitie of one head ouer Christes Church*, wherein he beinge contented to leaue the scriptures, soz that he coulde finde none soz his purpose, is saine to boultter by the matier by mans authozitie: beginning, proceeding, and endinge his matier therewith, whiche yeat (as hath béene declared) did nothing further oz serue his purpose. But here vppon special confidence that he hath alreadye pithily and fully proued his matter by the Scriptures, so liberally (as he thinketh) though vpon Cardinall Hosius his cosse, by him alleaged, he doth not a litle auauance him selfe, as hauinge Goddes woꝛde in chiefe vse, and estimation, & litle regardinge mans woꝛde in respect of it. In déede I must confesse that **M. Doz**man hath béene moze plentifull in bzinginge in the Scriptures into the face of open Court, than he is otherwise accustomed to be: but to what purpose oz effect he hath brought them in, I trust the discrete Reader doth well vnderstande, soz those Scriptures proue nothinge, that he alleageth them foze, and we do denie none of those thinges, whiche they proue. And notwithstandinge this sayinge of **M. Doz**man here: you shall well vnderstande, that in this and all other controuersies betwene the Papistes and vs, he and they all put their chiefe affiance and trust in mans woꝛde and authozitie, & vse it most, and almost onely: well knowinge that were the matier tried by Gods woꝛde, they should not longe haue many woꝛdes to say. But whereas the ould doctours though in déede holy fathers, yet as men, doo vary one from another, & sometime by sozgetfulnes, oz change of opinion,

¶

from

from them selves also: as longe as the sayinges of the doctours (the Scriptures set aside) shalbe searched, and for triall of the saide cōtrouersies alleaged, the Papistes doubt not, but they shall still finde somethinge to say, out of their sayinges, who doe vsually say one against another, and sometime (as I haue said) against them selves also. Wherefore what so euer M. Dorman here saith, he and they al doe knowe in dede, that were the matier tried by the Scriptures, whiche be euer constant and agréable to them selves in vnchangeable truth, al maters woulde shortly be at an ende. Neither doe we refuse the sentences and expositions of the doctours: neither wangle we aboute the sense of the Scriptures cleane contrary to their moste manifest sense, (as the Papistes doe) beinge assured, that although some doctours in some places may seme to make for them, in some maters: yet in all necessarie pointes of Religion, the most ancient, best learned, and greatest number of the doctours, most clearly, & wholly stande of our side, against them: as in this M. Dormans treatie, very bare of the Scriptures, and Goddes woꝛde, but trusted full of doctours, and mans woꝛde, I haue partly declared already, and shall in the proesse thereof thoroughly proue, and make the same moste manifest vnto the good Reader, by Goddes grace, I doubt not.

Dorman. Folio. 20.

And here to beg in with Ignatius that holy martyr, who for Ignatius the faith of Christe was with the teeth of wilde beastes torne, and as he writeth him selfe, sawe our sauour in fleshe: consider. I beseeche you in the prescribing of such order for obediēce in Christies church.

church as whereby vnitie might be preserved; what place of  
 preeminence be giueh to Emperours (who are of the laetie the  
 greatest estates) and what to Bishoppes, his woordes are these,  
 Principes obedite Casari, milites principibus, diaconi  
 presbiteris sacrorum presbiteris: presbiteri, diaconi & reli-  
 quus clerus, vna cum omni populo & militibus & principi-  
 bus & Casare, episcopo: episcopus Christo, sicut Christus  
 patri, vna vnititas per omnia seruetur. Princes (saith he) obey  
 your Emperour, souldiors your Princes, Deacons the Priestes whiche  
 haue the charge of Religion: Priestes, Deacons, all the rest of the  
 cleargy with the people what so euer they are, souldiors, Princes,  
 yea the Emperour him selfe, be you obedient to your Bishoppe: the  
 Bishoppe to Christe, as Christe is obedient to his Father, that so vni-  
 tie may in all pointes be obserued. Here may we see good Readers,  
 that euen in the daies of the holy martir Ignatius, it was then  
 thought necessarie and expedient, that for the better obseruinge of  
 vnitie, the Emperour him selfe should obey the Bishop. Well I  
 wote our aduersaries will not restraine this obedience to temporall  
 goernement, and therefore it must needes be vnderstanded of spi-  
 rituall and in causes Ecclesiasticall. But if the obseruinge of this  
 obedience be the way to conserue vnitie, what shall we alas thinck  
 of them that laboure to violat and breake the same: as doo all they  
 that trauaile to make Princes in matters of Religion to rule, and  
 Bishoppes to obey.

Nowell.

No doubt Ignatius was a most holy Bishoppe, and  
 constant Martyr: but he sayeth nothings for you, nor a-  
 gainst vs. For what place of preeminence should Igna-  
 tius geue to Heathen Emperours in Christes church:  
 It is wel known it was longe after his time (beynge  
 martyred in the. vi. yere of Traiane the Emperour) Hieron. de scrijs  
 or any Emperour were Christened. And how should be ptor, ecclelast,

he geue a place of p̄æminence in Chzistes Churchē to  
 them, who had there no place at all: And we doo not  
 denie, but that Emperours as wel as other men, cought  
 to be obedient to the Bishoppe, so you take withal that  
 which soloweth, that the Bishop be obedient to Chziste,  
 elles will Ignatius discharge vs of obedience to a By-  
 shoppe disobedient to Chziste. For he saith in the same  
 place that priests not beleauing truely shal lose euerla-  
 sting life, as wel as other: & would you S. Dozma, haue  
 vs to obey & solow such Priestes, so goynge befoze both  
 in false doctrine, & into hell to: To procéde we restraine  
 not the obedience whiche an Emperour oz other Prince  
 oweth to a godly Bishoppe, to tempozall gouernement:  
 I woulde therefore S. Dozman woulde restraine him  
 selfe from such trifling but we doo enlarge it to preach-  
 inge of Goddes woꝛde, that is teachinge, exhortinge,  
 reyprounge, comfoztinge, &c. binding, and losinge, and  
 ministringe of the Sacramentes accoꝛding to Goddes  
 woꝛde: all whiche be spirituall matiers, and in all the  
 whiche, all persons as well Princes, as other, ought to  
 obey Goddes woꝛde deliuered by the ministerie of the  
 Bishoppe, as I haue at large befoze declared. But see-  
 inge that holy martyꝛ Ignatius speakinge of obe-  
 dience, and makinge a rehersall of all degrees Ecclesi-  
 asticall, frō Deacons to Priestes, from Priestes to Bi-  
 shops, from Bishops to Chziste, &c. maketh no mention  
 at all of your owne heade of the whole Churchē, y<sup>e</sup> Pope  
 of Rome, (whiche heade you say is so necessarie, and  
 of all men without exception to be obeyed) what shal  
 we say: did that holie martyꝛ not knowe your Pope,  
 as yet in daēde vnbozne: Or did he, who forgat not  
 Deacons, and Priestes, so meane men in comparison,

forget

forget this your high head of all & wherefoze you shall hardly frame an argument of this sentence of Ignatius to proue your proposition, *That the head of the whole Church must needs be a Priest.* And in your translation of these wordes, *Obedite Episcopo, be you obedient to your bishop.* You haue not vsed that discretion that I looked for at your handes: for thereby you geue men to vnderstande, that by Ignatius every Bishop in his owne Diocesse is to be obeyed: and so that it maketh nothinge for your one head Bishop or Priest, but for the obedience due to every Bishop. You might haue done better to haue translated it, be you obedient to the Bishop: for so some would haue thought that the Pope, as Bishop of al Bishoppes, had bene meant: according as by your like allegations out of S. Cypriane, and S. Hierome in your former treatise, you haue bozne all men, and specially the simple in hande, that the sentences by them written of every Bishop, the onely and chiefe Bishop in their owne diocesse, were ment of your Pope, as onely and chiefe Bishop and head of all the Church throughout the worlde.

Dorman. Fol. 20.

ist. ad  
nirnenf.

*The same worthy Bishop and Constant Martyr Ignatius, writing in an other place ad Smirnenses, biddeth he them not to honour first God, next the Bishop as bearing his image, and then after the king.*

Translated out of  
Hosi<sup>o</sup> li. 1. fo. 39.

Nowell.

Concerning the order in Ignatius rehearsal, whereof Hosius and you doe gather the preeminence of Bishoppes aboue kings, I graunt, Ignatius might well make that order: for kings in his time, as I haue said,

¶ 3

being

being no Christian nor godly men, were onely to be obeyed in worlde matters: whome beinge Pagans, when that godly Martyr did see muche honoured, and the Bishoppes, who were guides to life euerlasting, so litle esteemed, he did well admonish the people of the honour due to them. But if he did nowe see Princes Christians, and godly, and also so litle honoured & obeyed of priestes their subiectes, being so wicked and proud, and claiminge immunitie fro all obedience to Princes, the blessed Martyr Ignatius would I beleue, tell an other tale of Christian Princes, than he hath tould of the Pagan Princes in his time: and would other where haue placed our wicked and proude prelates, hauing to much worldly honour, than he placeth those godly Bishops of his time, lacking all due honour. But if you do delight so muche to reason for authoritie by order of reherfall vsed some where in the Doctours: S. Peter hym selfe saith, Deum time: Regē honorificare. that is, feare God, honour the king. Thus saith S. Peter, without any placing of the Bishops betweene. What say you, is not here a president geuen to your Pope, by S. Peter (as y<sup>e</sup> Pope saith) his first sonder? why haue not Popes S. Peters successours, succeeded him in this point, specially nowe that Princes be Christians, but haue thrust them selues betweene God and the king: whiche is the glofe of the successours, and not the text of the first sonder S. Peter. And the like order is to be founde in suche times, as Princes were godly Time Dominū fili mi, & Regem &c. that is: feare God, my child, & the king, saith Salomon, when kinges as wel as Priestes were godly, & yet placed he not the high priest betweene God & the king. You wil peradventure say: It is feare, not ho-

nowe

1. Petri. 2. c. 17.

Proverb. 24.

nour he speaketh of here . It is in deede suche feare , as hath honour soynded with it, for the king was a worthy and godly Prince in his most doinges, as euer was: els if I graunt it to be feare onely, in that respecte surely might the Pope and his Prelates not vniustly claime a place of p<sup>r</sup>æminence aboue kinges : seing thei are by their tyranie moze terrible, not onely than any Ch<sup>r</sup>istian kinges, but also then all Perous, domitians, and diocletians . Further touching order in placing of godly kinges & Prelates, I wold not haue you forget that God him selfe by his Prophet Agg<sup>o</sup>us, in the place by you alleaged, doth fise times together place the Prince befoze the high Prelste . But touching Ignatius, seinge you haue alleaged. ij. places of him, you shouide haue done right well to haue added the third also, w<sup>r</sup>itten in the same epistle ad Philadelph. by you alleaged, which is this. Christus patrem deprecatus est, vt non deficeret fides Apostolorum. that is to saue: Ch<sup>r</sup>ist did p<sup>r</sup>aie to his father, that the faith of the Apostles should not faile, which sayng you haue prudently dissembled, for that it doth cleane subuert your chiefe firmament, that you take out of the Scriptures for your Pope : affirming that Ch<sup>r</sup>ist p<sup>r</sup>aied for Peters faith onlie , that it should not faile. And therup<sup>o</sup> you read, y<sup>e</sup> though the successours of y<sup>e</sup> other Apostles haue failed in faith, yet haue not y<sup>e</sup> successours of Peter at Rome failed, neither (as you say) cã faile in faith. But Ignatius saith, y<sup>e</sup> the p<sup>r</sup>aier was made for y<sup>e</sup> Apostles, & therfoze not for Peter alone, but for al in his name: as many things were said & comãded to him by name as alone, but in deede to al y<sup>e</sup> Apostles with him. But it is euident y<sup>e</sup> some of y<sup>e</sup> successours of al y<sup>e</sup> Apostles, Peter & other, haue failed in faith:

I meane:

De scripturis Ec-  
clesiasticis.

I meane suche successours as haue succeeded them in the cities and Bishopricks, where they ordeined Bishops. As the successours of John, at Smyrna: of Paule, in Grecia: of James, at Hierusalem: of Mathewe, in Ethiopia: of Andzewe, in Achata: of Philip, in Phrygia: of Bartholome, in India, of Jude in Perside: & the successours of Peter in Antiochia: for after S. Peter this Ignatius (as S. Hierome testifieth) was there the thirde Bishop. All the whiche cities, and Bishops sees, nowe are fallen from faith, to infidelitie: from Christ, to Machomet: and therefore the effect of that prayer of Christe, *I haue prayed for thee Peter, that thy faith shoulde not faile*, is fulfilled, not in certen cities, or Bishops sees, but in the Church of Christ, which is tied to no certen places nor sees, (for were Rome a fishe poole Christes Church shal remaine,) but is tied to that certen doctrine and faith of Iesus Christe, whiche Peter and the other Apostles beleaued them selues, professed, and taught to other. For if Peters see and successours shall not faile in faith, why is Antiochia, whiche was his see as well as Rome, and where this holy martyr Ignatius, was thirde bishop after Peter, why is it I say, failed in faith: what priuilege hath Rome as Peters see, moze than Antiochia Peters see: will they allege me the death of Peter there, and his and S. Pauls blood there shed: As though Christes death and bloodshed at Hierusalem should not make moze for that Apostolike see of Hierusalem, to continue in faith, than Peter and Pauls blood for the stablenes in faith of the see of Rome. Are not the Scriptures full of promises for the citie and church of Hierusalem: is not it an hundred times in the Scriptures called the holy citie: is not mounte Sion extolled  
 about

about the Moone, as the chosen mount that shall neuer  
 moue, & promesse made that God will still dwell there:  
 and yet that citie is now failed, and that mount mo-  
 ued from the faith: and by failinge hath proued, that  
 those saynges of the Scriptures were not spoken of  
 the citie or mounte it selfe, situate in Palestine, but of  
 Gods and Christes Church, wheresoeuer it were.

3.Reg. 11. c. 13.  
 3.Reg. 14. f. 21.  
 4.Reg. 19. f. 31.  
 Esa. 1. g. 26.  
 Psal. 2. b. 6.  
 47. a. 3. b. 12. 73. a  
 2. 77 g. 68. 124.  
 a. 1. & infinitis  
 locis.

What an impudencie therfoze is this of the Pope and  
 Papistes to bragge of Rome, & their Tarpeian Rocke,  
 (wherto is no praise, no commendation nor promesse  
 made in the Scriptures) as though the true faith could  
 not faile there, where it hath failed at all the Apostles  
 sees els, and at Peters see at Antiochia, and at the holy  
 citie of Hierusalem, and the chosen mount Sion? As  
 though the errours, blasphemies, and moste detestable  
 wickednes of Rome, and the Romishe Bishoppes were  
 vnto the wo:ld vnknown.

*Dorman. Fol. 20.*

*pist. ad  
 philippens.* Polycarpus, disciple to S. Iohn the Euangelist, of Priestes and  
 Deacons writeth thus, Subiecti estote presbiteris, & diaconis  
 sicut Deo & Christo. Be ye subiect to the Priestes and Deacons as  
 to God and Christ. Is this any other to saie then as the Apostle saide  
 before him, Obedite ijs qui vigilant pro animabus vestris.  
 Obey you them whiche kepe the watche for your soules?

*Nowell.*

So meruaille if Polycarpus, who in that Epistle bid-  
 deth all men to be obedient and subiect one to another,  
 do also will men to be subiect to their godlie Priestes &  
 Deacons of his time, as vnto God and Christe. For I  
 haue oft said, that al godly Bishops and Priestes prea-  
 chinge

*Polycar. ad Phil.  
 Oes vobis inui-  
 cem subiecti  
 estote.*

¶

change Gods and Chyistes woorde, bindinge and loosinge, and ministeringe the Sacramentes accordinge to Goddes and Chyistes woorde, (for of suche speaketh Polycarpus) ought of all men to be obeted as God, and Chyiste: for of suche it is sayde. Qui vos audit, me audit: qui vos spernit, me spernit. That is, he that heareth you, heareth me: he that despiseth you, despiseth me. Of suche is sayde by the Apostle, obeie you them whiche keepe the watche for your soules: whiche terte beztowed of Hosius, M. Dozman hath patched here to Polycarpus. But what maketh this for anie obedience due to suche Piestes, as will not be obedient to Gods woorde, neither do watche for our soules, but either slumbe, and sleape, or els watche against our soules, howe to deceiue vs, and to bzyng vs out of the righte waye: And if we will not obeie, they lay wayte for our liues, howe to bzyng vs to moſte cruell death. And what can you alleage, why a Chyistian Prince may not watche and take heede, that he, and his people to his charge committed, by the negligence, or fraude of suche, either sleapie, or malicious watchemen, be not deceiued, or betrayed: And that you may knowe that I speake nothing here besides Polycarpus his mynde, I wyll reherse you his full sentence, whiche M. Dozman hath, of good purpose you may be sure, moſte miserablie mangled, his woordes are these. Subiecti estote &c. We re subiecte vnto Piestes and Deacons, as to God and Chyiste. Ye Virgins walke ye with a chast conscience. Let Piestes be simple, mercifull in all thinges, conuerting all men from errour, visitinge all sicke folkes, not neglecting wydowes, fatherlesse children.

Hosius, lib. 1.  
fol. 37. b.

childezen, and poore persons : but alwayes proudbinge  
 good thinges befoze God, and all men &c. Thus farre  
 that holy Martyr Polycarpus, both declaring that we  
 ought to obey Priestes, and what manner of Priestes  
 they be, that we should obeye. Of all the whiche M.  
 Dozman hath onely nipped of the head, contained in  
 these fewe woordes, *Be ye subiecte to Priestes and Deacons,*  
*as to God and Christe,* to make a shewe thereof for obedi-  
 ence to Priestes : the reste showinge what Priestes  
 they be, whome we shoulde obey, he hath cleane lefte  
 out. Had I lefte out so muche, so neere folowing, so ap-  
 perteyninge to the very matier and purpose, as hath  
 M. Dozman here doone, what outcries shoulde we  
 haue had? I saye therefore M. Dozman, Polycarpus  
 hath tould vs what Priestes we shoulde obeye as God  
 and Christe, simple, mercifull Priestes, conuerters  
 of all men from errours: Priestes good to all men, sick,  
 poore, and destitute, wydowes, and fatherlesse: Pries-  
 tes that doo leade a godly life befoze all men. These  
 be they whom Polycarpus biddeth vs to obeye as God  
 and Christe. Whereof it consequentlie foloweth, that  
 Popes and Popythe Priestes, wylie Foxes, cruell  
 Woulfes, byngers of all men into errour, leaders of  
 all fatte panches, neglecters of all sicke, poore, wy-  
 dowes, and pupilles: yea the robbers, and spoylers  
 of all wydowes, by their mortuaries, Trentalles,  
 and Diriges: and Priestes of a molte hyle and ab-  
 ominable lyfe, befoze God, and all menne: suche  
 Popes I saye, and Popythe Prelates, we oughte by  
 a iuste consequence of that holie Martyr Polycar-  
 pus his doctrine, to auoyde, and to flye from

them, as from the Deuill him selfe.

And if the seely people be not hable either to auoide the contagion of their euill life, or to beware of their deceiptes, or to escape their crueltie: what can you alleage out of Polycarpus, or any other auncient goodlie father, but that a Christian Prince may watche, that the flocke of his people, to his charge committed, be not by suche scabbed and stinkyng goates corrupted, or by suche wylte fores beguyled, or by suche raueninge wolues, weried, and deuoured: To conclude, I praye you M. Dozman, either appoincte vs suche Pastours and Priestes, as Ignatius, Polycarpus, and the ould fathers doo speake of, and woulde haue vs to obey them: or shoue some cause why we shoulde vpon their wooorde, obeye and folowe suche Priestes, as they doo shewe to goe befoze to the Deuill: or why Christian Princes may not punythe, and remoue suche, nor Pastours, but Depastours, as doo deuoure and destrote the flocke. Howe M. Dozman fearinge you shoulde forget these his weyghtie argumentes, falleth to the recapitulation of them, though beinge in freshe memoize, as so lately treated of, and firste to his argument out of S. Paule.

*Dorman. fol. 20.*

Here consider I beseeche you, that saint Paules placinge of the 1. Cor. 12 Apostles, and in them the Bishoppes and Priestes their successors, in the firste and chiefe place in Christes Church, his callinge of them the Rulers thereof, and appointed so to be Act. 1. 20 not by man, but by the holie Ghost, was not to deceiue vs.

NoWel

Norwell.

You shall not néede so hartely to pray vs, we will gladly consider that S. Paules placinge of all the Apostles, and with them the Bishoppes their successours, in the first and chiefest place, emongst all ministers of Chriſtes Church, and calling them the rulers thereof, was no mans, but the holy Ghostes appoinment: and therefore made, not to deceiue vs, but to teache vs the truth: that is, that euery Bishoppe in his owne charge hath the first and chiefe place, and that therefore none can be befoze the first, noz aboute the chiefe. And withall we must néedes by iust consequēcie consider, that your placing of one Apostle in the first and chiefe place aboute all Apostles, and of one Bishoppe in the first and chiefest place aboute all Bishoppes, contrary to S. Paules, and the holy Ghostes placing of them al æqually in the first and chiefe place, is a placinge appointed by man, against the holy ghost, and therefore done to deceiue and beguile vs.

Dorman. Fol. 21.

*Remember, that if in matters of Religion the Bishoppes, and Priestes should haue folowed the ciuile magistrates ordinaunces, it had bene in vayne that Ignatius and Policarpus had the people, Emperours and Kinges none excepted, to be obedient and subiect to them. For wherein should they be subiect, or in what thing should they obey, if not in religion and matters thereunto appertaining? Reade ouer the auncient histories as well of the Greekes as of the Latines: peruse the doinges of Iues and Gentiles, paganes, heathen, or what soeuer people or nation you list, and you shall neuer finde any to haue bene so barbarous or far out of ordre, that first they had not their religion, and next their Bishoppes and Priestes, to whom they*

they wholie referred the ordre and disposition thereof.

No well.

We remembre also right well, that if in matters of Religion Priestes and Bischoppes should haue solowed the ordinaunces of ciuill Magistrates, who in Ignatius & Polycarpus times, were Pagans and Heathen men, they should haue done against Ignatius & Polycarpus his councill: for so they should haue receiued Paganitie in steede of Christianitie. But will you inferre hereof, that because Pagane Princes were not to be obeyed in Religion, therefore Christian Princes are not to be obeyed in causes Ecclesiasticall: how will you proue your argument if one should denie it: where you trouble vs so often with this one question, *in what thing should Princes obey Bischoppes and Priestes, if not in religio and matters therevnto appertaining?* How oft shal we tell you, that Princes and all men ought to obey Bischops and Priestes truely preachinge Goddes worde, lawfully thereby losing and bindinge, duellie according thereunto, ministeringe the holy Sacramentes: and that these be maters to Religion appertaininge: And these be offices peculiarly appertaininge to Bischoppes and Priestes, with the requitinge whereof as Princes may not medle, so doth the ouersight of them, that they do their saide offices duellie accordinge to Goddes worde, with other causes Ecclesiasticall before rehersted, apperteine to a Christian Prince: of the whiche causes Ecclesiasticall I haue made you reherfall very ofte, enen to the weyinge of the Readers. And I yet once againe do say: reade ouer all Ignatius, and Polycarpus, with all the oulde holy Fathers: reade ouer all the auncient histo-

rites Ecclesiasticall, as well of the Grækes, as of the Latines, as well of the Iues as of the Christians (foz of your Gentiles, Pagans, and Heathen, dashed in, onely foz the furniture of your eloquence, I doe make small accompte) and you shall neuer finde, but that godly Christian Princes had a speciall care to mainteine true Religion, to refozme it decayed, to restoze it fallen downe, to ouersee all the Bishoppes and Cleargie, that they did their duetie, to call vypon them, to comaunde them to doe their duetie, to punishe them beyng slacke in their duetie, or otherwise offendinge, and to depzue and depose them vppon their iuste deserte, to summon them to Synodes and Councelles, to ordze and gouerne them assembled, to know, allow, and confirme by their authozitie, lawes, and rites Ecclesiasticall, in such Synodes, foz the outwarde regiment of the Church, made, and ordeined et. You shall I say not finde in all the saide Histories Ecclesiasticall, but that godly and Christian Princes had authozitie herein aboue the Bishoppes and Priestes: and therefore were the saide Princes chiefe gouernours in those causes Ecclesiasticall, aboue the Priestes: and therefore our Christian Princes hauinge the same right, that they had, are by their examples likewise proued to be the chiefe gouernours aboue Priestes in like causes Ecclesiasticall.

*Dorman Fol. 27.*

*But to procede, Chrysostome calleth the Priestes the hart and stomacke of the Church. his reason is, quia in rebus Spiritualibus per eos totus populus gubernatur. because in spirituall gouernement all the people is governed by them.*

*To good*

m. 38. in  
Mar. 27.  
e Priestes  
e go-  
nors in  
rituall  
tore.

To good Readers here may you see that in Chrysostomes time, in that pure state of the primitive Church, all the people was in matters spirituall governed by (not the Kinges or other ciuile magistrates) but the Bishoppes and Priestes. Then were the Priestes in those matters iudges, and Emperours themselves subiectes. Then had Emperours and Kinges this persuasion that they could garnish their stile with none more excellent title, or name more honorable, then to be called the children of the Church.

No Well.

**M.** Dozman shoulde haue done well to haue taken in Chrysostome befoze his recapitulation, and not to haue left him thus stragglinge, or poste alone. But to Chrysostome I answere, if the Priestes be the harte & stomacke thei be not the head, and this argument, Chrysostome calleth the Priestes the harte and stomacke of the Church. Ergo, a Priest is head of the Church. I trust **M.** Dozman will mende, when he calleth to remembraunce his longe and lamentable discourse out of Nazianzene, against that odious disorde and confusion, when *the feete will be the head, the eyes the eares, the eares the eyes, and one membre will needes doo an others office, &c.* as **M.** Dozman hath befoze at large prosequuted. But now lo, a lamentable thing; the hart and stomacke will needes be the head: whiche **M.** Dozman there calleth iumblinge together, and makinge of an hotch potte. But I know **M.** Dozman will deride, or peraduenture fume at my grosnes, that see not the exposition folowing in Chrysostome. Quia per eos totus gubernatur populus: that is to saye, for by the Priestes all the people is gouerned, whiche (will **M.** Dozman say) doth proue the Priestes to be the head. I haue hearde a like phrase **M.** Dozman, that by the eyes all

all the bodie is governed: and I am sure it is as naturall a phrase, as the bodie is governed by y<sup>e</sup> stomacke, (which is yours here out of Chrysostome) yet are not the eyes for all that, the head, but in the head. I haue hearde also that by the sterne the whole shippe is governed, and yet is not the sterne the toppe gallant. I haue hearde also that a great Prince hath sailed in a shippe, whiche was governed by one of his owne subiectes, a cunninge shippe maister, and so the Prince in that iourney was governed by him: who also of Gubernari, the very worde here by you vsed out of Chrysostome, is called in latine Gubernator the gouernour: whome yet we do rather call the shippe maister, than the head: and be he the head of al his mariners, yet is he not his Princes head, though he be in that case his gouernour. Pea if the Prince see he gouerne foolishly, or perilously, he may not onely (as head in dæde) warne him thereof, but punishe him therefore. Lo M. Dorman you may see by Chrysostomes wordes in his time, the pure state of the primitive Church, Priestes governed the people by the preachinge of Goddes worde, and yet Christian Princes might neuerthelesse gouerne the Priestes in seeinge them to do their duitie, and if they did it not, in blaminge or punishinge them therefore.

Concerninge the stile of Princes, I know no Christian Prince, but he will be contented and gladde to be called the childe of the Church. And what Bishoppe so euer he be, that disdaineth likewise to be called the childe of the Church, I say he is a proude Prelate, and worthy to be your Pope. You, when you speake of the Church, woulde beare scélie soules in hande, that onely Priestes are mente. Where the truth is

S

that

that Christian Princes, and people be of the Church as well as you: you are ministers, that is seruantes of the Church, whether so euer ye wilbe called children of the Church, or not, chose you: godly Princes will not disdaine that title or name. But how prouue you that y minister or seruauant is the heade of his maisters childe, though he be admitted to wayte vpon it, to guide or gouerne it: muche lesse can ye prouue that he is head of his maisters whole familie, children and all.

Dorman. Fol. 21.

It is li. i. not. 10. is reported to haue openly professed Christe. who as Ruffinus witnesseth of him, beinge present at the firste generall counsell of Nice which was assembled about twelue hundred yeares agoe, had there deliuered vnto him certaine libelles and billes of complaints, that the Bishoppes had one of them put vp against an other. The which all as he receiued and put vp into his bosome: so after that he had refused to be iudge in their causes, affirminge that it became not him to iudge them, to whome God had giuen power to iudge him, and that therefore their querels (what so euer they were) they shoulde referre to the iudgement of almighty God; as hauinge no other iudge emongest men: he caused without once openinge them to see the contentes, to be throwen into the fire, that the brayle and discorde he saide of Priestes, might neuer goe farder into the knowledge of men.

Translated out of Hosius woord for woorde fol. 113. b. Scribit de Constantino Rufinus, qd cu episcopi q Nicea congregati fuerant, libellos ei quosdam putulificat &c. ad verbum vt hic. And D. Harding Cosur. Apol. fol. 309. b. hath the same.

Thus thought Constantinus the greate, the firste Emperour that is reported to haue openly professed Christe. who as Ruffinus witnesseth of him, beinge present at the firste generall counsell of Nice which was assembled about twelue hundred yeares agoe, had there deliuered vnto him certaine libelles and billes of complaints, that the Bishoppes had one of them put vp against an other. The which all as he receiued and put vp into his bosome: so after that he had refused to be iudge in their causes, affirminge that it became not him to iudge them, to whome God had giuen power to iudge him, and that therefore their querels (what so euer they were) they shoulde referre to the iudgement of almighty God; as hauinge no other iudge emongest men: he caused without once openinge them to see the contentes, to be throwen into the fire, that the brayle and discorde he saide of Priestes, might neuer goe farder into the knowledge of men.

But here our aduersaries (as blame them I can not seeing they will needes be patrones to desperate causes, if they be gladde to catche holde of a little) will perhappes say that I haue vndiscreetly behaued my selfe in alleaginge this auctoritie, which fardereth me not so muche one waie, as it hindreth me an other, in that by the historie it appeareth that the Emperour sat in the counsell with the Bishoppes.

Lib. 10. c. eccles. hi  
Constantin  
the Emp  
roureful  
to be iud  
in the Bi  
shops ca  
ses. On  
God the  
iudge of  
Bishopp  
causes.

Bishoppes.

Bishoppes. VVell, of the alleaging of this place who is like to get shame, and who honestie, who to winne and who to lose thereby (for our aduersaries also I am not ignorant thereof are wonte to bringe this example for them:) the triall thereof I leaue till suche time as it shalbe layed more wholly to my charge: whiche shalbe hereafter in bringinge to light such simple store, as they haue gathered together for the confirmatiō of their parte, from the examples of such Emperours, as sence Christes time haue reigned.

No Well.

That M. Dozman talketh of desperate causes doth wel appertaine to the Popes supremacie, and other popishe pelste, now dzinen ad accensos, and leste to the defence of suche p̄uisthe proctours as he is. Accēsi militēs. But for that Hosius, out of whome M. Dozman hath stolen this of Constantine, as all the reste, vnderstandeth no English, I would aske of M. Dozman, who doth so much auauance Priestes, and depresse Princes, whether he thinketh that all those Bishops assembled in the counsell of Nica were men of god iudgement or no? It seemeth they were, by that authoritie and estimation of thinges by them decreed, which they do to this day reteinē. Than why should not their commen consent & iudgement, deferring the iudgement in their cōtrouersies to y<sup>e</sup> Emperour as their iudge, be of god authoritie with you M. Dozman? me thinke that you, who haue stuffed this your booke with the sayinges of seuerall Bishoppes, and thinke it mēte that they shoulde be taken for god authoritie, shoulde not relect the consent of so many, so learned, so godly, so ancient Fathers, Doctours, and Bishoppes agræinge all in one. But they agræ all in one, that the Emperour ought to be

S 2

their

their iudge in their controuersies, and to him as their iudge, offre their billes of complainte. What will you shamefast man, so willinge to winne, and loth to lose, so carefull for honestie, and so fearefull of shame, and blame, say in this case: did that whole Councell (whose authozittie euer hath bene inuolable) erre in that one poynce: did those so many, learned, and wise Bishoppes whiche vnderstode all thinges, not vnderstande this thinge (whiche of all other thei should haue best vnderstanded) to wytte, what was the duetie of a Bishoppe, and what of a Prince: will you here make Bishoppes (whome other wise you auance aboute the sterres) such doultes in this matier, that they wisse not what they did: wil you make the Emperour whome you otherwise so depresse vnder all Priesttes so wise, that he knewe both his owne, and the Bishoppes dueties, better than them selves: Wel M. Dozma hither to you haue taught vs out of the Scriptures, of the oulde Testament and the nue, and out of auncient doctours, and holy Fathers, to require the lawe, the knowledge of doubtles, the decidinge of controuersies, at Priesttes handes, not at Princes. Now you doe teache vs a nue lesson, that we must learne of the Prince, of one Prince, & the same a souldier all his daies, moze exercised in armour, than in booke, rather then of .318. godly Bishops, most learned doctours, holy Fathers, assemblinge, and agræinge together in one, what be the dueties both of Princes, and Priesttes: and so vnwares you haue constitute and made the Emperour iudge ouer so many Bishoppes, whose sentence & determination you make the said Bishoppes to folow, & obey, as the iudgement of him, that knew what was their dueties, better than them selves.

And

And thus you see good readers, howe by **D. Dozman** his iudgement of Bishops, be they neuer so many, so learned, so holy, if they geue any authoritie to Princes, or submitte them selues any thinge, be ignoraunt what they do and say, and are not to be credited. But one Bishop alone saynge any thinge for the authoritie of Bishops, and to the depressinge of Princes, is of authoritie authentical, and not to be denied or doubted of. Againe Princes though other wise vnlearned, & therefore not to be consulted in doubtles, yet if they depresse them selues, and auance Priestes, are wiser and better learned, and moze to be credited than Bishoppes, as is here the Emperour Constantine: but if they saye any thinge for their owne authoritie, demanding their right ouer Priestes, then be they Heretiques, ambitious, ignorant, not to be credited: than whether Princes or Bishoppes be Superiours, you must learne not of Princes, but of Bishoppes: for that is moste indifferent, because they be no parties. For where this same Emperour Constantine, doth by his Epistle threaten al suche Bishoppes as would not obey his commaundement that he would depose them, which is the office of a Superiour, and doth in very many places take vpon him, as the Bishops Superiour, (as shall hereafter at large appeare) in this point the Emperours iudgement falsed him, will **D. Dozman** say, and that he was induced hereto by the Arians, and therefore not to be credited in those places, where he taketh authoritie to him: but in the other, where he putteth it from him to the bishops, there was his iudgement irrefragable. This is **D. Dozmanns** diuinitie, this is his Lawe, this is his Logike, his rethorike and al togeather. But the truthe is

that:

Theodoric. lib. 7.  
cap. 19.

that those so many, learned, godly, ancient Bishoppes, and fathers, according to their learning & knowledge, acknowledged the Emperour for their Judge: and that moste worthy and wyse Prince, not willinge that matters of greatest weight should be hindered by such babbling of the Bishops amongst them selves, vpon a pretie and most wittie pretence of humilitie, as though he were not worthy to decide, and determine, cōtrouersies amongst Bishops, did in deede decide, determine, and end them all at once, by burning al their babbling billes of complaint in a light fire at once, as worthy no better suruey: and so made a final end, and determination, of all the saide Bishops controuersies, and set them a worke about matters of moze importaunce: this is the truth. Now in case that worthy Prince of his singular modestie, and humilitie, would not at the beginning of that councell take vpon him all due authoritie, yet that he thought he might decide controuersies amongst Bishops if he would, shall evidently appere by his doinges hereafter. And that the refusall of a thing vpo humilitie, maketh nothing against the right of the so refuser, if other authorities shall faile me, I will proue it by M. Dozman him selfe, if he dare denie it. But seinge the Emperour was by M. Dozmanns iudgement inferiour to euery one of those Bishoppes, was it not trowe you a bould part of him, to appoinct them all a certaine daie to come together befoze him, and to geue vp to him as their Judge, their billes of cōplainte, and he at the daie appointed to sitte downe, to take of them the said billes, and whan he had them, at once to burne all his Lozdes the Bishoppes letters in a lighte fire: For thus muche doth the Storie in the said place by M.

Rufinus Histo.  
Eccl. lib. 1. ca. 2.  
Sez6. li. 1. ca. 17.

by M. Dormā alleadged, recozd of him. And here it seemeth he forgate his due obedience: for sure I am, they deliuered them not to be burned by him all at once after that sorte: they had spent to muche labour, studie, and time, in conceiuing and writinge of them, than to purpose them to suche a short ende. Seing therefore he burned all their billes of complainte, and determined thereby that they should ceasse from all suche controuersies, and be quiet, were his woordes neuer so humble, his deepe was the fact of a superiour ouer the said Bishops, ending at once all their controuersies. And no doubt, had the Emperour offered his billes of complaint to all the saide Bishoppes, they all woulde not, nor might not haue serued his one bill, as he alone serued all theirs. M. Dorman, who so chafeth and sumeth at vs befoze, *as men who will be controuled of none, but God onelie,* Dor. fol. 8. b. 9. a. (whiche yet we neuer said nor thought) and threatheth vs with one, that shall kepe vs vnder, meaninge their Hope, doth yet well prouide here, for his popishe Bishoppes, in his marginall note, *that onelie God is the* Sup. fol. 8. b. Judge, *of Bishoppes causes: whiche if it be true, than will they sists for themselves well enough.* (that I may vse M. Dormans owne woordes) and farre better, than we haue shifted for our selues, who haue bozne away all the blowes at their Lordshippes handes.

Now concerning the Emperours being and dealing in the said councill: you see M. Dorman hath differred the matier, as yet to colde to be handled: and reason is, we taste his time, until he ware warmer: which shall he saith hereafter, in y bringing in of our simple stowe: whiche, he hauing such great stowe of god stuffe, as you see, may of good right contemne and despise.

Yet this may I be boulded to saie in the meane season, that as Constantinus sat in the councell with the Bishops, there was neuer yet Emperour nor king forbidden I dare well saie to sute, nor neuer I trowe shall. And ouer this, that in there being it is not very likely that he encroched any thing vpon the spirituall iurisdiction, bothe by that whiche you haue heard before, and also for this, that being on a time as S. Austen reporteth of him, required by the Donatistes, Epist. 166 to take vpon him the hearinge of the cause, whiche depended betwene them and Cecilian, the Arche bishop of Carthage: he refused to medle therewithall, because (saith he) non est ausus de causa Episcopi iudicare, because he durst not be iudge in a Bishops cause. But leauing this for the while, let vs examine, the doinges of other good and catholike Emperours.

Translated out  
of Hosius. lib. 2.  
fol. 113. 2.

No Well.

Where you may be bolde and dare well saie, that there was neuer yet, nor neuer shall you trowe Emperour nor king be forbidden to sit in councell with the Bishoppes as Constantine the Emperour saie. I see you may be bolde and dare well saie that, whiche no learned or wise man may be boulded or dare well to beleaue, finding the contrarie in all histories of Constantine, and all your Popes, and popes the Prelates doinges, in all latter councels, which you may as well trowe they will leaue, as that a Foxe will forsake his manners, with the casting of his heare. Powe is here a peece of M. Dorman's arte: this saying of S. Augustine touching Constantine the Emperour, Hosius hath immediatly befoze, the historie of Rusine, concerninge the burning of the Bishops billes. And is not M. Dorman setting that which was immediatly behinde, immediatly

mediatly befoze, woꝛthy to be accounted an authour: Where you D. Doꝛman ſpeake of incroching vppon ſpirituall iuriſdication: Conſtantine vſed no incroching, but his owne right. But where you dare well ſaye that Conſtantine reſuſed, becauſe he durſt not, to be iudge in a Biſhops cauſe, and doe allege theſe fewe woꝛdes of S. Auſtens long Epiſtle. Non eſt auſus de Epiſcopi cauſa iudicare, he durſt not iudge of the Biſhoppes, (Cecilianus) his cauſe: though you neuer reade S. Auguſtine, yet had you put but as manie moe woꝛdes in your Hoſius next ſolowing, the Emperours authoritie in this cauſe, and ouer Biſhops, who he made his deligates had appeared. But ſeing you curtall, not only S. Auſten, but Hoſius your authour alſo, after this ſort, and ſo woulde leaue the matier ſoꝛ a while as you ſay: I dare well ſay, that you gladly woulde leaue this falſe opinion in the Readers mindes, that Conſtantine the Emperour, durſt not in dæde iudge in that Biſhoppes cauſe, and that he had no right to iudge in any biſhops cauſe: ſoꝛ the ſimple Reader of your woꝛdes can gather none other. But though you woulde leaue the matier ſo, I will not ſo leaue it, vntill I haue declared by S. Auguſtine, that you will be boult, & dare wel to deceiue all the woꝛld, if you coulde: and that in all your wꝛitings, without all feare of God, oꝛ ſhame of the woꝛlde, you attempte all meanes, howe you may by mayming and manglinge the ſaiynges of the ancient Doctours, moſte plaine when they are fully alleaged, concele and hïde all truthe, and mainteine the falſe vſurpation of your Pope, and popiſhe Bꝛelates vppon Chꝛiſtian Pꝛinces, with all other your deteſtable errors. S. Auguſtine after he had declared that wicked

Auguſt. epiſt. 166  
Ad Donatiſtas.  
Vide etiã ep. 162  
& in breuiculo  
collationum cõ-  
tra Donatiſtas.  
Tom. 7. col. 560.  
Hoſius fo. 123. a.  
ex Auguſtin. ſed  
eam diſcutiendã  
& definiendam  
epiſcopis delega-  
uit.

E

commant

cōmaundementes of vngodly Princes are not to be obeyed: of the commaundementes of godly Princes (such as was Cōstantinus) somewhat befoze these fewe wōrdes by *M. Dozman* here alleaged out of him, saith thus.

Augu. Epist. 166.

Quando aut Imperatores veritatē tenent &c. that is to say. When Emperours hold truth, they geue commaundemēt foꝛ the very truth againstt error, ȳ whiche cōmaundemēt whosoever dispiseth, he procureth to him selfe iudgement oꝛ damnation: foꝛ both he is punished amongst men, and shal haue no power to shew his face befoze God, who will not do that, whiche by the heart of the king, the truth it selfe commaundeth. These are *S. Augustines* wōrdes, the whiche he largely prosecute: where you see he excepteth no man, Priest, noꝛ other, from the obedience of the commaundement of a godly Prince, in matters of Religion. It foloweth by & by after, in *S. Augustine* of Bishop *Cæcilianus* his very cause (whiche *M. Dozman* here toucheth) by these wōrds. Scitote quod primi maiores vestri causā *Cæciliani* ad Imperatorē *Constantinum* detulerunt, sed quia *Cōstantinus* non est ausus de causā episcopi iudicare, eam discutiendam atque finiendam episcopis delegauit. &c. that is to say: know ye that your firste ancestors brought Bishop *Cæcilianus* his cause befoze the Emperour *Constantinus*: But because *Constantinus* durst not iudge of the Bishops cause, he did delegate it to be discussed, & ended by Bishops. The whiche was done in ȳ citie of Rome, *Melciades* Bishop of that Church being president, with many other his Colleges oꝛ felowes. Who when they had pronounced *Cæciliane* to be innocent, and had by their sentence condemned *Donatus*, who had made the schisme at Carthage: a-  
gaine

*Ipsē sibi iudiciū  
acquirit, frontē  
non habebit a-  
pud Deum.*

*Præsidente Mel-  
ciade Episcopo  
illius Ecclesiæ cū  
multis collegis  
suis.*

gaine your men came to the Emperour, and murmured of that iudgement of the Bishops, in the whiche they were overcome. For how can he that hath an euill cause praise the iudges, by whose iudgement he is overcome? Yet againe, the most mercifull Emperour, gaue them other iudges, Bishops, at Arelatum or Arle, a citie of Fraunce: and your men appealed from thē to the Emperour him selfe, till that he also him selfe did heare the cause, & did pronouce Cæcilian to be innocēt, & them to be quarrellers. Neither thei being so oft overcome could rest, but wexed y<sup>e</sup> Emperour with cōtinual cōplaintes vpon Felix Aptungitanus, a Bishop by whom Cæciliane was ordeined, sayng that he was a traitour, and therfore that Cæcilian coulde be no Bishop, because he was ordeined by a traitour: vntill y<sup>e</sup> matter by the Emperours commaundement, being heard by Alyanus the proconsul, Bishop Felix him selfe also was tried to be innocēt. Than Constantine y<sup>e</sup> Emperour made a most seuerer Lawe against the partie of Donatus. And the Emperours sonnes folowing their father, gaue the like cōmaudemētts. Thus farre S. Austine truely translate and muche moze to that purpose, with six wordes of the which long processe, gleaned and piked out, M. Dormā would beare the simple Reader in hand, y<sup>e</sup> Constantine the Emperour, would not medle in a Bishops cause: as a matter wherin of right he being a Prince, might not medle. But the truth manifestly appearing in y<sup>e</sup> processe, declareth, that he both might, & did medle and iudge in the cause of the said Bishop Cæcilianus: wherein M. Dorman saith he wold not medle. For that S. Austen saith that the Emperour durste not be Iudge in a Bishoppes cause, was not for that he thought of right

Litigator malus

Alios iudices Episcopos dedit.

Causam cognosceret &amp; pronunciatet.

Of this matier S. Augustine in treateth also lib. 3. Cōtra Cresconiu Grāmaticū cap. 69. &amp; 70.

Traditor.

The same is also to be seen Epist. 162. & in Breuiculo collat. cum Donatist. Tom. 7. colum. 560.

he might not, as the processe proueth: but for that the matter being intricate, and he not so exercised in suche controuersies, and otherwise occupied in the most weightie affaires of a great parte of the worlde, could not him selfe thzoughly vnderstande the groundes of that matter. And therefore he delegated or committed that matter vnto Bishoppes, as men for knowledge & leasure, mete to be his delegates or commissioners therein, by them to be tried: as if a good Prince shoulde saye to two suters, he durst not be iudge betweene them in a title of right, standing in narrowe & doubtful poines of the Lawe, but would appoinct the Judges, or Sergeantes at the Lawe, as men learned and skilfull in such matters, to be his commissioners for the deciding therof.

Causa delegauit.

August.

Lib. 3. cap. 71. cōtra Cresconium grammat. post epicop. iudicia partes ad iudicium Imperatoris pductæ fuerunt.

Delegauit causā Episcopis.

Likewise durst not Constantine the Emperour be iudge at the first in Bishop Cæcilians cause, but afterwarde by ofte hearing of that controuersie, the Emperour vnderstanding the bothome of the matter, vpon appellatton made from the iudgement of the Bishop to his iudgement, he heard and finally determined the said Bishops cause. In the whiche processe by S. Augustine declared, I praye the good Reader, note first that the Bishop of Rome with his colleges or felowes, were the Emperours delegates, whiche proueth them inferiours to the Emperour, whose delegates they were. And that S. Augustine calleth the said Pelciades, not head of Christs Church, here in earth, as these men doo, but Pelciades Bishop of that Church, (of Rome) for other wyse he was not taken, nor knowen than: and he calleth the other Bishoppes, whiche were in cōmission with him, his colleges or felowes. Secondly note, that whan the one partie would not holde them selues

Cū collegis suis.  
The Pope at this time had no College of

selves content with the iudgement of those Bishoppes, the Emperour assigned and appointed them or (as the Latine hath) gaue them other Iudges, as the Bishoppe of Arle in Fraunce, and others. Whereby it is euident, that he, who assigned them to be iudges, was superiour to the Bishoppes, who were by him assigned. And withall, it is proued to be most false, that the Papistes say, that a sentence once geuen by the Bishop of Rome, may not by any other Bishoppes be hearde, or examined: seeinge this matier once determined by Pelciades Bishoppe of Rome and his Colleges, was by the Emperour afterwarde referred to the Bishoppe of Arle and his Colleges. Thirdly note that laste of all one of the parties appealed from the Bishoppes to the Emperour him selfe, who heard the cause, and proued sentence therein him selfe. Which argueth the Emperour to be superiour to the Bishoppe of Rome, and all the other Bishops, from whome to him all appellatton was made, and by him the matier was finally ended. And further the Emperour assigned and commaunded *Alfane* the Proconsull to heare, examine, & determine the cause of *Felix* the Bishoppe of Aptunge, who was also falsely accused by the Donatistes as a Traitor, vpon surmise that he had burned the holy Scriptures or deliuered them to be burned (whiche our Papistes now doe indeede) and so it is euident, that Constantinus durst not onely him selfe be iudge in a Bishoppes cause, but durst also make his officers iudges therein, (wherin yet surely Christian Princes, ought to vse the aduise of the godly learned and specially of the Cleargie.) And this determination in these Bishoppes causes and matiers Ecclesiasticall made by the Emperour Constantine,

Cardinalles you must vnderstand. Imperator alios iudices Episcopos dedit.

*Imperatoris iussu.*

*Traditor.*

August. epist. 166  
 Defunct<sup>o</sup> ē Cō-  
 stātiō sed iudi-  
 ciū Constantini  
 vinit &c. & li. 3.  
 cōtra Cresconiu  
 gram. cap. 71.  
 post episcopalia  
 iudicia, partes ad  
 iudiciū Cōstan-  
 tini perductæ  
 fuerunt.  
 Itē in breuicūlo  
 Collationum cū  
 Donatistis.

S. Augustine every where calleth the iudgement of Constantine the Emperour: which terme our Papistes now a daies, can not abide to be attributed in such matters to any, but to Ppistes onely. Let M. Dozman now goe, and with sixe wordes piked out of this longe processe of S. Augustine, beare the simple people in hande, that Constantine the Emperour refused (foz that of right he might not) to medle oz be iudge in a Bishoppes cause. And yet he may still make this bragge, that the Emperour encroiched nothinge vppon their spirituall iurisdiction. foz in deede he vsed his owne iurisdiction, of right due to him, as to a Christian Prince. Now may the discrete Reader vnderstande, why M. Dozman, in this treatie of Constantine is yet so coulde, why after he had of so longe a processe of S. Augustine rehersted sixe wordes, thereby to abuse the simple, he saith, he will for a while leaue this and examine the doinges of other Emperours. Were there good Reader any zeale to y truth, any feare of God, oz shame of the worlde, in these Papistes, they woulde neuer handle matters, of so manifest truth, so guilefully, falsely, and shamelesly.

Dorman. Fol. 22.

Translated out  
 of Host<sup>r</sup> woorde  
 for vwoorde,  
 lib. 2. fol. 119. b.  
 Beginninge and  
 endinge iuste  
 with him.  
 D. Hardinge.  
 Confur. Apol.  
 fol. 309. b. hath  
 the same.

Valentinianus the Emperour, was from that desire of governinge in Church matters and ecclesiasticall causes so far, that as Sosome- nus writeth of him, being required on the behalfe of the Bishoppes that inhabited the partes of Hellepontus and Bithinia, that he woulde vouchesaufe to be present with them to entreate of certaine pointes in religion to be reformed: he made them this answer. Tome, beinge one of the people, it is not lawfull to search out suche things. But the Priestes, to whome the charge thereof belongeth, let them assemble them selues where they list.

valētinia.  
 Tripart.  
 histor. 1.  
 7. cap. 12  
 Valētinu  
 his answe  
 beinge r  
 quired to  
 entreme  
 dle in m  
 ters of F  
 ligion.

Notwell.

*Nowell.*

To this example I doe answere Hosius as I befoze answered his formar example of the Emperour Constantinus, for as they be both like, so will the like answere serue them both. That the Emperour Valentinian said this moze of a certaine humblenes, or for y he was otherwise occupied with mosse weightie affaires, or than that he thought in dede he might not of right assigne the Bishops a place of counsell, or intreate with them of maters of Religion, shall appeare by his assemblinge of Bishoppes together, and by his dealing in maters of Religion. His milde and gentle nature longing litle meddling in suche maters, may appeare by the saide Authours them selves, by M. Doorman here alleaged: who comparinge the said Valentinian with his brother Valens, doe showe, howe Valens woulde inforce all men to his heresie: but that Valentinian troubled not suche as were of contrarie opinion to him, though beinge in dede heretiques & Arians. His great busines appeareth by Nicephorus his historie, who reporteth his answer thus: *Mihi inquit Imperator, negotijs occupato, & reipub. curis distento res huiusmodi inquirere non facile est.* that is: To me, saith the Emperour, being occupied with busines, and ouer charged with the cares of the common weale, it is not easie to searche out suche thinges. Thus you see howe the Emperour hauinge litle luste, or leysure to searche out suche thinges (for of searchinge doe all the Histories speake) frameth an excuse by humblenes, as saith Sozomenus, & by his great busines, as witnesseth Nicephorus. And though in dede the searching of such maters Ecclesiasticall doe belonge rather to Bishops &

Sozom. lib. 6.  
cap. 6. & 21.

Niceph. lib. 11.  
cap. 3.

Sozom. lib. 6.  
cap. 6. Non est  
fas.

Nicephor. li. 11.  
cap. 3. Non est

Bishops,

facile. VVhiche  
expoūderh vwhat  
non est fas,  
macaneth.

Princes, than to Princes (as doeth also the searchinge of the narrow pointes of tēporal lawes belonge rather to the Judges and Sergiauntes at lawe, than to the Prince) yet doeth not that proue, but that a Christian Princes authoritie is chiefe and aboue such searchers: vnlesse M. Dozman do thinke that there is alwaies greatest or least authoritie in maters, where is y grea-  
test or least learning in the same maters. Reason it is, I graunt, that the Christian Prince beinge in dēde chiefe in authoritie, but not beinge also chiefe in lear-  
ninge, should haue either learned Councell with him, or learned delegates for him in causes Ecclesiasticall: as I haue befoze out of S. Augustine declared, that Constantinus the Emperour so had. And where it is euident by hystories Ecclesiasticall, y y said Emperour Valentinean did cal together Bishops befoze him at diuers times after the example of Constantine: did admonish the Bishoppes of their duetie, did deale in the election of Bishoppes, did summon Bishops to Councils, & did medle in maters of Religion: (as shal hereafter be most manifestly declared) I may conclude, that he so spake, & was so minded, and gaue ouer of his right at that time, was moze of his humble nature & persuasion, than he would not, or of his great busines, that he coulde not, than of any vnlawfulness, that he might not do it: for that he afterwarde did it, I shall at large proue, and most manifestly declare in answeringe the next place folowing: wherein M. Dozman soloweth still this mater of Valentinean.

Further M. Dozman may be ashamed stil to goe about to make so many learned & godly Bishops, beinge

Sozom. li. 6. c. 7.

(as testifieth Sozomenus) of y right faith, y is, of good iudgement,

judgement, and beinge also assembled together in a multitude, so that they might vse common aduise and counsell, to make them all I say, suche doubtles, that they knewe neither what appertained to them selves, noz to the Emperour: but muste learne their duetic of a Lay man, a Souldiar, exercised in warres all his life. But it is moze credible that so many, so godly, so learned Bischoppes did better knowe what was the duetic of Bischoppes, and Princes also, by Goddes laws, than one suche Souldiar, moze occupied aboute armour, than in the bookes of the Scripture: Ergo, the Emperour may be present with the Bischoppes, to intreate of pointes of Religion, soz so you confesse, was the iudgement of all these Bischoppes of the righte faith, and of god iudgement. Ergo againe, Bischoppes haue no authoritie of them selves to come together in Councell, about matiers of Religio, without the Princes permission and licence, soz the whiche they sente Bishoppe Hypatian their Embassadour to the Emperour (soz so is the storie) declaringe this to be the iudgement of all those auncient holy Fathers, the learned, and godly Bischoppes of Hellespont and Bythinia, with other Bishops of the right faith in Iesus Chritt: that is, to be the iudgement of all Bischoppes, who had god iudgement.

Sozom. li. 6. c. 7.  
 Hypatianū le-  
 gatū eligūt qui  
 ab imperatore  
 peteret vt ipse  
 ad corrigendum  
 dogma conue-  
 nire permitte-  
 ret.

To conclude I pray the god Reader, cal to remem-  
 brance all that whiche I have a litle befoze answea-  
 red to the like obiection of D. Dormans, concerninge  
 the Emperour Constantine, and those 318. Bischoppes  
 assembled in that great, generall, mozte auncient, and  
 holy Councell of Nice. Whome, agræinge in minde  
 with this company of godly learned bishoppes assen-

bled at Lampfacum, for the authoritie of Princes ouer persons, and in causes Ecclesiasticall, M. Dozman likewise setteth to schoule, to learne the lesson of their owne duettie, to the Emperour Constantine, a man both exercised in warres all his life, and also yet scarcely Christened: (whereas otherwise M. Dozman most deprezeth the Prince, to the obedience of what so euer the Priest shall say.) for this mater of Valentinean, and that of Constantine, good Reader, are in all pointes, altogether one: so that who so euer knoweth the one, knoweth bothe.

Soerat. lib. 1.  
cap. 39.  
Constantine vvas  
not Christened  
but immediatly  
before his  
death.

Dorman Fol. 22.

*This is the same Valentiniā, who willing the Bishops to chouse a meete man to the see of Millain beinge by the death of Auxentius then voided, said to them these wordes. Talem in pontificali cōstituite sede, cui & nos qui gubernamus imperiū sincerē nostra capita submittamus, & cuius monita dum tanquam homines deliquerimus, necessariō velut curantis medicamenta suscipiamus, that is to say. Choose you such a Bishop, as to whome euen we which gouerne the Empire may sincerely submit our selues, and whose monitions, while like men we fall, as pacientes doo the Physicians receiptes, we may necessarily receiue.*

Theodori  
lib. 7. hist  
eccl. cap. 8

No well.

You do vs wronge M. Dozman, to set vs a worke to seeke this mater in Theodozetus seuenth booke, who did write onely fīue bookes. But to the matter.

First what iurisdiction so euer you woulde the Bishop by this place should haue geuen him ouer the Emperour, it is euident that it appertaineth peculiarly to the Bishoppe of Millaine, and not of Rome.

Againe

Againe we doe not, nor euer did denie *M. Doorman*, but that a Prince erringe ought to submitte him selfe to the wholesome monitions of the Bishoppe, as he beinge sicke ought to submitte him selfe to the wholesome Councell of the Physitian, for that is the similitude or comparison here vsed, (as afterwarde in deede, *Theodosius* the Emperour submitted him selfe to the saide *S. Ambrose*) but I truste *M. Doorman*, you will not proue hereby, that the physitian is therfore the Emperours superiour: And to what purpose than can this place serue you, but onely to showe your grosse ignorance, and great impudencie, in alleadginge a patche of that, as for you, whiche wholly maketh against you, and with vs: whiche may be most manifest to suche as will reade this whole historie of the election of *S. Ambrose*, writen by *Socrates*, *Theodozetus*, and *Sozomenus*: out of whose writings for the simpliar sortes sake I will truely note out the principall poyntes.

Firste saith *Theodozetus*, *Valentinean* the Emperour goinge into the west parte of the Empire, instructed the inhabitaunce there withall iustice, and begonne with the Preachers of our Religion. For whan *Aurentius* Bishoppe of *Millaine* beinge an *Arian* was dead, the Emperour called the Bishoppes thereabout vnto him, and spake thus to them. You as men nourished by in the holy Scriptures, can not be ignozant what maner of man he ought to be, to whome the dignitie of a Bishoppe is to be committed: and that he ought to instruct those, that be vnder him not by doctrine onely, but by his manners and life, and so forth. And he concludeth, as *M. Doorman* here alleageth that he woulde haue suche a man to be

*Theod. li. 4. c. 5.*  
*Valentinian* the Emperour instructinge his subiectes with iustice, begone firste with the Preachers of religion.  
 The Emperour calleth the Bishopps together.  
 The Emperour exhorteth the Bishopps, and telleth the what is a Bishopps duetic.

chose Bishoppe, as to whome him selfe also beinge Emperour, might sincerely submitte him selfe, and whose monitions, as moſte wholesome medicines, he might gladly receiue. Thus farre Theodozetus.

Soerates. lib. 4.  
cap. 30.

Sozom. lib. 6.  
cap. 24.

Theodoret<sup>o</sup> lib.  
4. cap. 6.

Sozom. illum q̄  
cūsimē ordi-  
nari præcepit.

Theodoritus  
imperator iubet  
statim initiari  
& creari Epif-  
copum.

Theodoret. lib.  
4. cap. 7.

Synodum in  
Illyrico coëgit,  
&c.

Theodorit. lib.  
4. cap. 8.

Vos inobediētes  
reperiti estis. Nos  
quidē ordine à  
primo ad vlti-  
mū processimus  
tractatione no-  
stra, ipsi vero  
vosmetipſos ab-  
alienastis.

Further when the people of Myllane had reques-  
ted S. Ambrose, yet not Chriſtened, to be ordeined  
their Bishoppe: S. Ambrose refusinge it, as an office  
too great, and vnmeet for him, the matter beyng  
declared to the said Valentinian the Emperour, he sen-  
deth to the Bishoppes, willinge and commaunding  
them to goe through with the matter, and to Chri-  
ſten Ambrose, and to make him Bishoppe: for that it  
was he saide, evidently Goddes elation, rather than  
mans. Peca and further saith Theodozetus, that the  
saide Emperour hearinge dissentions aboute Religion  
to be in Asia and Phrygia, by his authoritie called to-  
gether a Councell, and sente the articles there decreed,  
and confirmed, to suche as were at dissention, willinge  
them to agrée to the saide decrees.

And yet further saith the same Theodozetus  
that the saide Emperour ioinally with Valens, and  
Cratian, did write to all the Bishoppes of Asia, Phry-  
gia, Carophrygia and Pacatiana, declaringe what  
paynes they had taken from the beginnyng to the  
ende, to the procuringe of vnitte, by the saide Synode:  
by their authoritie commaundinge the said Bishoppes  
to keepe the decrees of the saide Synode, and to cease  
from persecutinge one an other: and they do rebuke  
certaine for their disobedience, and accurse and con-  
demne them, if they do not reſorme them selves.

These pointes I say, truely reported out of the selfe  
same histories, booke, & chapters, that M. Dozman for  
him.

him alleadgeth, do evidently proue, that Valentinian thought it lawfull enough for him to assemble Bishops, and to deale in Ecclesiasticall matiers, whiche M. Doorman befoze would beare the simple in hande not to be lawfull. And the same poinctes wilthall do proue, that Christian Princes, yea & good Princes (whose sayngs and doinges M. Doorman with other Papistes allage for them) did then vse as great authoritie ouer persons and in maters Ecclesiasticall, as we this day do attribute to our Christian Princes. For, who was it, whom these ancient histories Ecclesiasticall do testifie, to haue according to iustice, instructed all his subiectes, beginning with the Cleargie, Preachers, and Bishops: the Emperour Valentinean. Who was he, that called together and sommoned the Bishoppes to the election of a nue Bishop: Valentinean the Emperour. Who was he that by a solempne oratio admonished the Bishops, going to the said election, of their bonden duties: Valentinean. Who was he, that allowed the election of Ambrose, and commaunded the said Bishops forthwith to ordeine him Bishop of Millane, who was a temporall man, no Clarke, no Priest, yea as yet, not Christian: the Emperour Valentinean. Whom did all those Bishoppes streight obey so commaunding them, without any exception made to Ambrose, as yet no Clarke, no Priest, no Christian: Valentinean the Emperour. Howe what maner of Bishop proued he thus elected, and made Bishop of a lay man, by the Emperours commaundement: Better than euer was any made by the Pope, of any of his holy shauelinges, this many hundzeth yeeres. Further in dissentions about Religion, who sommoned the Bishops to counsels: Valentinean:

Valentinian the Emperour. Who by his authoritie sent  
 abroad to Bishops disagreeing, the decrees of the saide  
 council, commaunding them to be obedient, & to receive the  
 Valentinian. Who declareth what paines he had take  
 in the pacification of Ecclesiastical dissentions, from  
 beginning to thend: Valentinian. Who reprehendeth,  
 accuseth, condemneth such Bishops, & all other, as will  
 not obey: the Emperour Valentinian. To conclude who  
 declareth that the Emperour Valentinian of his autho-  
 ritie did all these thinges, & in what places: so; soth the  
 histories Ecclesiastical tripartite of Socrates, Theodo-  
 ritus, & Zozenus, & specially Theodoretus, in very  
 places by M. Dorma alleaged, for the authoritie of priests  
 about Princes. So your waies therfore M. Dorman, &  
 alleadge vs hereafter Valentinian the Emperour out of  
 Theodoretus, or other ecclesiastical histories of him, or  
 other Princes for your purpose, that all the world may  
 vnderstand, & haue in admiration your great diligece in  
 searchig, your good iugement in choosing, your dexteritie,  
 & specially your modestie, & shamesfastnes in vsing, & had-  
 ling of your prouses, piked out for the prerogatiue of your  
 popish Prelacie. Now good Reader, I haue, I trust, per-  
 formed the I promised to proue by Valentinian the Empe-  
 rours assembling of Bishops to councils, & by his deal-  
 ing in matters of Religion, the his former refusal to do  
 the like, when he was required, was either of busines  
 that he then could not, as also Nicephorus expressely as-  
 firmeth, or of a certen loue of quietnes, & litle meddling,  
 that he then would not, rather than of lacke of right, the  
 he might not so haue done. And that therfore the moste  
 gentle Prince sought of his own nature an excuse of his  
 blenes, of all others excuses moste acceptable, why at  
 that

that present, he wold not doe that, which he afterwarde  
so often did.

Dorman. Fol. 22.

icola<sup>o</sup> Pa-  
in Epist.  
Fauftū.  
o. r. cōcil.  
expurg.  
iti.

This to be short is he, whiche would not so much as be present  
when Sixtus the B. of Rome was charged with certen accusations,  
but rising from the council left him to be iudged of him selfe.

Nowell.

This is very short & substantiall stuffe that you doe  
here knitte by the matier withal D. Dozman, and you  
haue a special grace to be neither shorter noz longer, thā  
is Cardinal Hosius, but as iust of the same use as may  
possibltē be. But to the matier it self I doe answerē Ho-  
sius thus. First Peter, Crabbe & Collectour of the cou-  
cels, who hath placed amongst other thinges this frag-  
ment *De expurgatione Sexti Papæ*. 3. of the expurgation of  
Houe Sixtus the third, here by D. Dozman alleged for  
authoritie, cōfesseth that the copies of the said fragmēt  
which he had, were so crabbed, so intollerably diuers &  
false, & many times it could not be vnderstanded what  
they intended, or meant: and he is shrewdly afraide, lest  
y readers will \* shake their heads, & laugh in their sea-  
ues, whē thei shal reade such stuffe. Wherefore D. Doz-  
man hath done right wel to be short, & to knit by y ma-  
tier for his Hopes to be iudges in their owne causes (for  
in dōde y is the shortest way.) with suche short, & sub-  
stantiall stuffe, as is this expurgation of Houe Sixtus y  
third: a worthy matier to be had to some place of expur-  
gation, to such conuenient vse as is mete for it, as shall  
hereafter plainly appeare. The effect of that processe,  
as farre as I could gather of the wordes of thre print-  
ted copies, written in latine, worse I beleaue than any  
Romayne Carter did speake in those dayes, is this.

Trāslated vword  
for vword out of  
Hof. li. 2. f. 119. b  
Hic ē ille Valē-  
tinian<sup>o</sup>, qui nec  
interesse voluit,  
cū Sixto pōtifici  
quoddā crimina  
fuisent obiecta:  
sed surgens a cō-  
silio dedit in ar-  
bitrio Sixti epi,  
vt iudicaret iu-  
diciū suū.

To. i. de expurg.  
Sixti. In primum  
nitione ad lec-  
torē. Propē ex-  
emplariū intol-  
lerabile nimis  
que & differen-  
tiā & deprava-  
tionē &c. Vt nō  
nūquā quid in-  
tendat nō valeat  
intelligi. &c.

He is drin<sup>g</sup> very  
often to make  
this confession.  
\*Nemo ergo cas-  
put subānando  
moueat. &c.

One

Crescentius (vel  
Crescētio) quidā  
timēs Deū quas  
ex nobilitate  
cōposuerat p an-  
nos vitæ suæ, oēs  
facultates suas  
eccl. reliquit &c.

<sup>a</sup> Marian<sup>o</sup> habuit  
in semetipsum &  
discessit ab eo.

<sup>b</sup> Ita vt accēderet  
August<sup>o</sup>, vel ma-  
ter eius furore  
& suspēderint se  
ad inuicem a cō-  
munionē.

<sup>c</sup> Qm̄ in meo  
arbitrio ē iudi-  
care & in iudi-  
care tamen meo  
non abscondatur  
veritas, alias, iu-  
dicare, & non iu-  
dicari.

<sup>e</sup> Leuauit se Au-  
gust<sup>o</sup>, & dedit in  
arbitrio Sixti e-  
piscopi iudicare  
iudicium suum:  
& discesserūt cū  
Augusto oēs, et  
erat sicut in p-  
stinū munita (vel  
vnita) ecclesia,  
ita vt cū gaudio  
& ioco discede-  
ret Valērianus

One Crescentius (whom one of the Copies after the Italian, not latine phrase, calleth Crescentio) a man y feared God, whan he died, left all his possessions to the Church, one of the manours of the which Crescentius lying in Sicilie, neere to the landes of Marianus, the said Marianus would haue had of Sixtus Bishop of the citie of Rome, the whiche the saide Bishop denied him.

Wherfore <sup>a</sup> Marianus being angry, & ioyning with one Bassus (who was also so; an other cause offended with the said Bishop) accused the Bishop to Valenti- mean the Emperour, that he had lien with a Ponne, named Chyslogontes, or Chyslogonis. <sup>b</sup> Wherupō the Emperour being very angry, and absteining from cōmunion with Bishop Sixtus, called befoze him and the whole Senate of Rome, into S. Peters Church in Rome, the said Bishop Sixtus. Where Epiphanius the Priest saide with teares: let triall of this matter be made, that the Church be not defiled. But Marimus the exconsull (so the textes call him) answered, that it was not lawfull to geue sentence against the Bishop. Wherupon Bishop Sixtus said, <sup>c</sup> although it be in my choise to iudge, & not to be iudged: yet let not the truth be hid. Than the Emperour Valentinian commaūded Bassus to confesse all the matter, threathning him, that if he proued not his accusation true, he should be in the Churches, & Bishoppes daunger, and power, and shuld be condēned. And the <sup>d</sup> Emperour allowing Marimus his sayng, that it was not lawfull to geue sentence against the Bishop, let Sixtus the Bishop be iudge in his owne cause: and so went his waye, with ioye and sport, insulting vpon Marianus and Bassus the accusers, and so the Church was quiet as afoze. Upon an other

other day Sirtus the Bishoppe called together all the Priestes of the Citie, <sup>a</sup> & late in iudgement in the same place, where the Emperour late befoze: and kept a coucell with the said Priestes, and condemned Bassus and Marianus, and deprived them both of the Communiõ: and sent copies of their cõdemnation to all Bishoppes. When Bassus one of the accusers heard this, he take the matier very grieuouly, <sup>b</sup> and offerred to leaue al his landes to the Church, vpon condition, that he might be receiued to the Communion, but he could get no grace. Marianus the other accuser laughed, and scoffed at the matier, and saide, it is wryten in the wordes of the Gospell: forgeue, and it shalbe forgeuen you, whiche whan Sirtus the Bishoppe heard, he said: It is wryten in the Gospell, who so euer sinneth in this world it shalbe forgeuen: but he that sinneth against the holy Ghost shall not be forgeuen, neither here, noz in the world to come: and he did not receiue them to the Communion, so that they both beinge in that case, passed out of the world. And Sirtus the Bishoppe condemned them the .viij. of the calendes of Septembze: and sittinge in his seate, iudged thus, sayinge: There is no seruaunt aboute his Lord, noz disciple aboute his maister. <sup>c</sup> And for so much as Bassus & Marianus said of me sinner, that I had to do with an whoze, I haue read ouer the Gospelles in the place, where it is wryten, whan Iesus late & wrote with his finger vpon the earth, and because the Iues coulde not finde how they might condemne him, they brought him an adulteresse oz whoze. And Iesus answered thus. If any of you be without sinne. let him cast a stone at this woman. And by these wordes of the Gospell, Bishoppe Sirtus iudged his see. This geare

August<sup>o</sup> à Sixto Episcopo, intul-tans (alias exul-tas.) Mariano & Basso.

a Et fedit in eodem loco, quia ibidem consistebat Augustus, & fecit cū omnib<sup>9</sup> cōcilhū & dānas ut Bassum & Marianū ita vt cōmunionem eos ambos vnitos subleuaret.

b Ita vt oīa prā-dia sua q̄ cōposuisset, p̄ annos vitæ suæ (vel dū posuisset annos vitæ suæ) oīa ec-clesiæ derelin-queret vt ad cōmunionem reuerteret, & non subleuaretur.

c Quia dixerunt Bassus & Marianus de me peccatore, & scortī alsimilarem negociū relegi Euangelia in loco vbi scriptum est: sedente Iesu, & scribente digito in terra, & quia nō inueniebant Iudei, quomodo

eū dānarent, ad-  
 ulterā aduxerāt  
 ei. Et hoc respō-  
 dit Iesus: Si quis  
 ex vobis est sine  
 peccato, inijciat  
 in istā lapidē. Et  
 per hęc verba  
 Euangelica iu-  
 dicabat sedē suā.  
 Actū in basilica  
 elementa alias,  
 Heliana. Hoc  
 indiculū collegit  
 Archidiaconos  
 alias Archida-  
 mus presbyter,  
 & ipse quasi in-  
 chartarium ec-  
 clesiaz, alias char-  
 tarum ecclesiaz  
 collocavit.

was done in y Helian Basilike, or great Church. These notes did the Archidamus Priest gather together, and he laide it vp, as it were into the librarie of the Church. This is the processe truely (as farre as I could vnderstande suche kinde of wrytinges) translated worde for worde, out of the treatie by M. Doorman, out of Hosius here alleged: and I haue noted in the margent the latine as it is in the two original or most auncient printed copies. But Oh S. Hierome, S. Ambrose, & S. Augustine, who woulde thinke that in your learned daies, the Secretarie of the Pope, & Church of Rome, the mother of the Romane or latine tongue, would, or coulde wryte suche latine, to the which I thinke, there is no brasse nor coper so course, that it may be in courtesnes any thing comparable thereto?

Againe concerning the matier: this authoz testifieth y the Bishop of Rome did iudge, & geue sentence in his owne cause: that he would not be pacified with Bassus his accuser being pænitent, and offeringe al his landes (which belike were great) to the Church, for a mendes: that he called the accusing of him, the sinne against the holy Ghost, not remisable in this worlde, nor in y worlde to come: & so did let the die without hope of grace. And y the saide Bishop should be so ignoraunt of the Scriptures, to compare the Trompet, with the abusinge of whome he was him selfe accused, to the aduultresse brought to Christ to be iudged: and to peruert the ordrs of the Scripture, and to say, y whan Iesus sate, & wrote with his finger vpon the groude, the Iues not finding how to condene him, brought an aduultresse vnto him: where as in dæde thei brought her, befoze he did wryte. And to conclude, that the Pope iudged his see by these  
 wordes

woꝝdes of our sauour . If any of you be without sinne let him cast a stone at this woman : whiche woꝝdes doe not cleare him, noꝝ his see, but should rather cōdēne him as guiltie, though not to be accused by suche, as were as euell as him selfe. Al̄ ȳ which must needes be a leude forged lie of Sixtus Bishop of Rome, who (as Bishops thā were) was bilike, both wise, learned, & godly. Al̄ this matter stāding thus, P. Dozman in ȳ ende of his treatie of Valentinian the Emperour, as a man meaning to knit by the matier with some short & substantiall stuffe saith: *This (Valentinean) to be short is he, whiche would not so much as be present whē Sixtus the Bishop of Rome was charged with certain accusations, but rising frō the councill left him to be iudged of him selfe.* This is the euidence of impoꝝtaunce that these mē haue to pꝛoue their Pope iudge in all causes, and in his owne cause too, as well as other mens: whiche euidence of impoꝝtaunce P. Dozman promised he would bꝛinge into the face of the open Court. Woe woꝝth ȳ Churche, which, leauinge the true triall of the Scriptures, vseth such euidence, & will compell vs to be tried by such euidence as this is: wherein is not so much truth, rime, noꝝ reason, as there is musike & melodie in this sēly songe: I toke my harpe into my hād & twange ȳ my stringe a. oꝝ in any other moze folish and leude rime than this is. Foz the moze folish it is, the mēter a resemblance is it of such leude lies, and sifter answer to such allegatiōs, as are by these falsaries bꝛought into the face of open court, foz right good euidence, and of very great impoꝝtaunce. Now in this leude fable yet is there moze against P. Dozman, than with him. Foz if the Pope appeare befoꝝe ȳ Emperour to be tried he acknowledged him therein foz his iudge, If the Emperour gaue him

Doman *supra*  
fol. 17. b.

Augustus dedit  
in arbitrio Sexti  
Episcopi iudica-  
re iudiciū suum.

choise (for so is the Latine in all the sit. copies) to be his owne Judge, it lay in the Emperour to haue not geuen him that choise: which you vnderstanding M. Dozman, haue guilefully misreported the wordes thus: he leste him to be ruded of him selfe: but for so muche as M. Dozman him selfe (I thinke)thanked this expurgation to be but slender euidence, he adioyneth for further ayde y<sup>e</sup> Epistle of Pope Nicolas. who liued about. 860. yeares after Chryste, a man with tothe oz naile laboringe by this expurgation and other like taggage to proue that no man may iudge the Pope of Rome, whiche being by such indifferent witnessess testified, muste needes be so, you knowe.

Dorman. Folio. 22.

Translated out  
of Hosius woorde  
for vwoorde,  
fol. 38. b. & 119. b  
Valentinianus  
iunior Impera-  
tor Iustinian  
impulsu cū puer  
adhuc esset p-  
pemodum &c.

His sonne also Valentinian (succedinge his Father in the Empire, Valētinian the sonne proclaimed he him selfe chiefe gowernour in causes Ecclesiasticall: True it is, that beinge yet a childe, and seduced by his wicked mother Iustina, to fauour the horrible heresie of the Arrians: he began to affect that title. But after S. Ambrose like a true Bishoppe, and faithfull councelor, had tolde him that it apperteigned not to him, so pretende any auctoritie or right to meddle with the ouersight of Gods matters, that to him belonged his palaces, and to the Priestes the Churches, that he shoulde not auance him selfe but be subiect to God, and giue to him that which was his, reseruing to Cesar that which was Cesars.

Lib 5. epi  
fol. 33.

Lib. 5. epi  
fol. 32.

Nowell.

Hosius lib. 1 fol.  
38. & 2. fol. 43. b  
& 119. b.

Hosius alleageth this place thre times in his booke against Valentinian, out of whome you haue translate this whole procelle worde for worde, & after your custome to obscure the mater, you haue set befoze that, whiche is after both in S. Ambrose, being in his. 33. Epistle, & in Hosius.

Hosius: and that whiche is befoze in Hosius, & S. Ambroses. 32. Epistle, like an artificer, you haue set after: els you vse Hosius his very wordes both in y entering to the matier, & in the concluding of it. And here appeareth all the colour you haue to exempt you, who would seeme an author, frō being not onely a selie, but a dissembling, and vngratefull translatour, whiche that holie father S. Basil doth so muche abhorre. And you vnterly confounding and menglinge the order of S. Ambroses his treatie (as may to the learned that will compare you with him, plainely appeare) do compell me also in answering to folowe your vnoorderlie order.

Epist. l. ad Greg.  
Theologum.

To your question, did Valentinean the yonger proclaime him selfe chiefe governour in causes Ecclesiasticall?

I answer, he did not: for he woulde haue bene, and other perswaded him that he was not chiefe governour in causes Ecclesiasticall, and therefore bothe would he haue taken vpon him, and others did beare him in hand farre otherwyle, than either do our Christian Princes take vpon them, or any man goeth about to perswade them to do. Where you say, S. Ambrose would him, that it appertained not to him, to preēde anie authoritie or right to medle with the ouersight of Gods matters, this is not to mollifie, but to corrupt S. Ambrose, to make the matier seeme like our Princes doinges. For S. Ambrose willet him, that he should not thinke that he had any imperial authoritie ouer Gods matters, whiche I am sure, may as well be said to any Bishop, as to any Prince. And sure I am, that our Christian Princes neuer take any such thing vpon them, but take them selues to be subiectes to God, whose imperial authoritie declared in his word (and not their own imperial authoritie) they must, and

Ambros. lib 3.  
epist. 33. & Hosius  
lib. 1. 39 & 2. 43.  
Noli te grauare  
Imperator, vt  
putes te in ea  
quæ diuina sunt  
imperiale aliquid  
ius habere

will obey in Gods matters : and therefore they will not  
 auance them selues, but be subiect to God, renderinge  
 to God that whiche is his : and houldinge them selues  
 contented with that whiche belongeth to Princes . To  
 haue Churches or temples to be deliuered vp into their  
 handes, they desire not, as did this Valentinian : nei-  
 ther send they armed men by force to take possession of  
 the said Churches , as he did : neither erpell they true  
 preachers, and place Arians in their towines . Suche  
 presumption therefore against God, & violence against  
 godlie Bishoppes, Churches, and temples, M. Dozman  
 doth vnfairly applie to our Christian Princes humbling  
 them selues befoze God, & most farre from all violence.

*Dorman. fol. 22.*

*Ambros. lib5.  
 Epist. 32.*

*After that he had proposed to him the exāple of his father, who  
 not onely in woordes said, that it was not his parte to iudge amongst  
 the Bis hops, but establis hed also a lawe, that in causes of faith and  
 Religion, yea in the examination of the maners of Bishoppes and  
 Priestes, onely Bishops should be iudges.*

*NoWell.*

*Hof. li. 1. fo. 38. b  
 Supra fol. 22. a.*

*The worde of Valētinian the elder, that it was not  
 his part to iudge amongst Bishops, are the very same  
 wordes that were of him befoze by M. Dozman allea-  
 ged: whiche wordes that they were spokē, by that most  
 myld Emperour of a certen modestie , and lacke of ley-  
 sure, rather than of any lacke of right to deale with the  
 Bishops in Religion, I haue by Nicephorus his playne  
 wordes, and by the Emperour Valētinian his dealing  
 with them therein, befoze declared. And also by the iud-  
 gement of al the Bishops of Hellepontus & Bithinia,  
 and*

*Sozom. li. 6. ca. 7  
 Epist. p Helle-  
 sponū & Bithi-*

and all other Bishops, who helde the true faith of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that is, by the iudgement of all Bishops, that had true iudgemēt, I haue I say, proued already, that the Emperour Valentinian might be present with the said Bishops, to entreate of certē pointes of Religion, than to be resoꝛmed, foꝛ that they required this of him, as meete and conuenient in their iudgemēt by him to be done, besides the hissoꝛie, I haue your confession, D. Dozman. And though you and other aduersaries do thinke the curtesie of one Prince vnercised in Religion and boꝛes, moꝛte exercised in warres & armour, to be of better authozitie against Princes right foꝛ Priests vsurpation, than is the said iudgement of so many, so learned, so godly Bishops. to the contrarie: the iudgement I say, of Bishoppes of the right faith in Jesus Christ, that is, of right iudgement, and Bishops assembled together by commune aduise to iudge the best: yet I trust all good, wylle, learned, & indifferent men, will iudge the stated iudgement of suche, so many Bishoppes, so qualified byshoppes, to be of moꝛe authozitie foꝛ the right of Christian Princes, than the vnskillfull curtesie, and gentle woꝛdes of one souldiar, is to the contrarie: specially seinge the deedes of the said Valentinian, of moꝛe effect than woꝛdes, pꝛoue his authozitie in these matters, as I haue befoꝛe largely declared. Of the Lawe made by the saide Valentinian h elder, I say the same, that I said of his woꝛds. No mervaille if a gentle Prince, made a gentle Lawe. And in remembꝛaunce of Constantius, and Iulianus the Emperours vnlaufull, cruell, and wicked handling of godly Bishops, suche a lawe might seeme a necessary Lawe, lest the like might solowe after, as had happened be

niam, ac quicūq;  
alij filium patri  
coessentialē di-  
cunt. &c.

Ante fol. 22, 23

ned befoze. But where that Lawe comprised, that onely  
 Bishoppes should haue the examinatio, not of doctrine  
 onely, but of Bishops manners also, it sheweth it selfe  
 manifestly to be mans, not Gods Lawe. For touching  
 manners, it is to euident that godlie Princes both of  
 the olde Lawe, and of Christian Religion, haue both  
 examined the maners of Bishoppes, and punished wic-  
 ked Bishoppes, for their euill maners. And suche a law  
 vpon occasion, made by a Christian Prince, may vpon  
 occasion lawfullie by Christian Princes be altered. In  
 Valentinians time when Bishops were learned, and  
 godlie of life, and Emperours readie to be incensed a-  
 gainst suche godly Bishoppes, and for the moste parte  
 vchristened (as was this Valentinian the yonger) or  
 long differing to be Christened, suche a Lawe, to stafe  
 suche Princes either vchristened, or vnlearned, or vn-  
 skilfull, and withall rashe, from the examination of  
 Christian doctrine, & godly Bishoppes maners, might  
 be suffered: specially the Bishoppes of that time, being  
 both them selues of a seuerer life, and seuerely repressing  
 the licentiousnes of their Cleargie, but in this corrup-  
 tion of doctrine, and life of our popische Bishoppes and  
 Cleargie now a daies, one winking, and bearing with  
 an others both false doctrine, and wicked life, it were an  
 hurtfull and pernicious Lawe, tending to the mainte-  
 nance and continuance of suche superstitions, errours  
 and heresies, as the Popes and their Cleargie, haue or  
 uerwhelmed Christs Churche, and Christian Religio  
 withall. But what say I than to S. Ambrose, who vs-  
 seth these wordes & Lawe of the Emperour y father, for  
 authoritie against Valentinian y yonger: I say S. Am-  
 brose vsseth the exaple of y modestie of y father, an aged,  
 graue,

catholike, and christened Prince, like a wise and godlie Bishop, to stay the rashenes of a yonge Prince the sone being vnlearned, and without experience, infected with heresie, and yet not christened, takinge vppon him all lawfull and vnlauffull thinges. And the same I saye to all the residue of S. Ambroses wordes touchinge that matier, and that such examples neede not, where Princes are christened, godly, and voide of suche rashnes.

*Dorman. Fol. 23.*

After that S. Ambrose had willed him to search the scriptures, Hosius, lib. 1. fol. 38. b. 39. a. where he should finde that Bishops ought in matiers of faith to be iudges ouer Emperours, not they contrariwise ouer Bishops: After D. Hard, Cōfut. Apol. fol. 317. b. that he had bidden him call to his remembraunce, if euer he so much as hard, that in a matter of faith the Lay men were iudges ouer the Bishops.

*Nowell.*

S. Ambroses wordes, a litle befoze this place by Ambros. lib. 5. Epist. 32. Doymā here alleaged, are these: Si docendus est Episcopus &c. that is to say. If a Bishop must be taught by a Lay man, what he should folowe, than let the Lay mā dispute, & let the Bishop heare, & let the Bishop learne of the Lay man. But surely, if we doe examine the orde of the scripture or ould histories, who is it, that can denie, that in a cause of faith, I say, in a cause of faith, Bishops are wont to be iudges of Christian Emperours, not Emperours of Bishops. Thus farre S. Ambrose. Ambros. ibidem In causa fidei, in causa inquam fidei epōs tolere de Imperatorib<sup>o</sup> iudicare. &c. And you should haue done wel Doymā, not to haue omitted here the intemperancie of vnlearned Lay men in S. Ambrose his time, taking vpon them to teach the learned Bishops: that the diuersitie of those, and our times, & doinges might haue appeared. And you should

not

not have omitted the repetitiō of these woꝝdes, *In a cause of faith, I saie, in a cause of faith*, whereby is signified that by S. Ambroses iudgement, Princes might be iudges of Bishoppes maners, not withstandinge Valentinian the elders Lawe, that suche iudgement, shoulde apperteine to onely Bishops, as you haue befoze alleadged.

And touching cases of faith and Religion, we denie not, but that Bishops of ould time, being better learned thā were the Princes in matters of faith and Religion, did teache and instruct the Princes in the truth, did iudge, yea, and by excommunication condemne also the wicked factes of Princes: as did not long after this S. Ambrose vse Theodosius y Emperour soꝝ his hainous murther.

We take not from learned Bishoppes (as Valentinian would haue done) the right of disputing, and of teaching true Religion to Christian Princes, and all other men publihely, and (whiche is necessarily soynd) of iudging what is true in Religion. For how can they teache the truth, who cā not iudge what is the truth: we take not from thē the office of iudging also in causes of binding & loosing, or of excommunicatiō and absolution, soꝝ of these rightes of Priestes doth S. Ambrose speake.

And true it is, that all these rightes do peculiarly apperteine to godly and learned bishops, suche as S. Ambrose speaketh of, as vnto Gods and his Churches ministers. And we do confesse that neither Valentinian, neither any other man had euer heard, that any godlie Princes, or other Lay men, of them selues, without the aduise and assistance of the godly learned, specially of the Cleargie, toke vpon them to be iudges of Bishops in a matter of faith, as S. Ambrose testifieth, this yong Valentinian would haue done. Neither did we euer

heare,

Ambros.

Si Docendus est  
ep̄s a Laico. &c.

heare that anie good Prince would be iudge in a matter of lawe over his iudges, without the advice & assistance of others learned in the Law. And what inconueniēce doth folowe hereof, I pray you. But where *M. Dozman* would braue all iudgement over Princes in matters of faith to bishops, by *S. Ambrose* his wordes, I wold aske of *M. Dozman*, whether an Arian Bishop shalbe iudge over the Emperour, or any other Lay man, or me in the cause of our faith in Christ Iesu our Sauour? I trowe not: and yet was he called a Bishop. And whether the whole Ariminense coucell assembled of aboute 400. Bishops shuld be iudge in the same cause over the Emperour, or other Lay men? I trowe not: and yet was it called a generall counsell in those daies, of as many both Lay men and Bishoppes (I thinke) as it was denied to be a counsell of the other side. Leauē therefore your vaine names of Priestes, and Bishops, as though they should dispute, teache, and iudge Lay men, in cases of faith, onlie because they haue the names of Priestes, and Bishops, by *S. Ambroses* minde: who (as in the same Epistle by you alleaged plainly appeareth) would neither suffer by his will any Arian Bishoppe to teache or iudge, and abhorred the whole counsell of so many hundreth Bishoppes assembled in Ariminum. And therefore geueth *S. Ambrose* all men to vnderstande, that he speaking of Bishoppes to teach, dispute, and iudge, meaneth onely of learned and godlie Bishoppes: suche, as vntill you proue your Pope, and popishe Priestes to be, (as you shall neuer proue, whiles they be, as they be) you shall in vayne alleage *S. Ambrose* for you: or against vs. For, shall an ignoraunt Bishoppe teache the true faith, or be iudge

*Ambros. ibidem*  
lib. 5. epist. 32.  
*Maximo concilio*  
*Ariminense ex-*  
*horreo, &c.*

theresin : shall sir John lacke learninge, teache the pooze plowman in the countrey the true faith: If you saie he shall : I aske, howe he can : shall Pope Boniface the eight teache, that it is necessary to saluation for all men, to be vnder the Bishop of Rome, and shall he be iudge, howe, and in what sorte all men must be vnder hym selfe : shall he condemne all that will not so be vnder him, though other wyse good Christian mē, though dwellinge in Greece, in Asia, in Ethiopia, though vnder Priestler John, in the vttermoost Africa, or els whsare, who peradventure neuer heard of the Pope, neither doe knowe, whether he be blacke or whyte, neither the Pope of them : Neither can therefore ignoraunt Priestles dispute, or teache, neither ought wicked Priestles to be Iudges of godlines : noz any Priest, to be their head and ruler of them, of whom he scarcely euer heard, or they of him. S. Ambrose no doubt exempteth vnlearned and wicked Bishoppes, as well as vnskillfull and wicked Princes (suche as thar was this Valentinian the yonger) from iudgement, and intermedling in maters of Religion.

Other wyse touching wyse and godlike Princes, S. Ambrose could not be ignoraunt, what Constantinus had befoze done in the causes of the Bishoppes Caelianus and Felix, befoze declared, and in manie other lyke causes : neither coulde he be ignoraunt, that all the godlike Bishoppes of Hellesponte and Withinta, with many others, had by their Legate Bishoppe Hypatianus, praised Valentinian this yonge Emperours father, that he woulde vouchsaue to be present with them, to entreate of certen poindes of Religion to be reformed. And as S. Ambrose was not ignozant

De maiorit. &  
obedienc. cap.  
vnam sanct.

ignorant of these things, so was he not against Theodosius the Emperour, doinge the like, that did Constantinus, and as was required of Valentinianus. But neither Constantinus, nor Theodosius, nor any other godly Emperour, would take vpon them as did Constantinus the Emperour, & as this yonge Valentinian would haue donne: nor would suffer any Lay men vnder them so to doe, as did those vnder the other: that is, to take vpon them the right of Priestes, to teach the Bishoppes, being better learned than them selves, to dispute, the Bishoppes hearinge & houldinge their peace, as learners: for of such speaketh S. Ambrose. Let M. Dozman lay S. Ambroses sayinges against Valentinian the yonger, yonge in yeres, and yonger in learninge, experience, and wisdom, and also infected with the Arian heresie, and as yet not Christened, who (as S. Ambrose saith) when he knew not as yet the Sacramentes of the faith it selfe, and was therefore vnmeet to take vpon him the iudgement of faith, would yet without all aduise or assistance of any godly learned, haue taken vpon him the iudgement of the very greatest, and highest pointe of our faith: let M. Dozman I say, lay S. Ambrose sayinges against such yonge Valentinians, where he can finde them: and spare to reproche godly Princes, most farre from such rashenes, impietie, and vnchristianitie. And if M. Dozman will say ought to the purpose, let him bringe out of S. Ambrose, or any other auncient godly Fathers of the Primitive Church proufe, that learned and godly Christian Princes, suche as be in these daies, (wherein popish Bishoppes and Priestes be either so vnlearned that they can not teach, or wickedly learned, and teach that, whiche is naught)

Ius sacerdotale.  
Ambrosius. li. 5.

epistola. 32.

Si docendus est  
Episcop<sup>o</sup> à laico  
quid sequatur,  
laicus ergo dis-  
puter & episco-  
pus audiat: episcopus  
discat à  
laico.

This appeareth  
in the said. 32. &  
33. epistles of S.  
Ambrose.

Lib. 5. Epist. &  
Histor. ecclesi-  
astica.

Rufini li. 2. c. 17.

takinge to them learned & godly counsellors, Clerkes, and others, or assigninge for them learned and godly delegates, may not take ozdye for the refozming of such a Cleargie, and of Religion by them decayed: but that suche vnlearned asses, or wicked Prelates, shoulde still remaine them selves vncontrolled, and iudge learned and godly Christian Princes, and al other learned, and godly Lay men. I trust you shall sweate well M. Dozman, or you can bzinge any one sentence or worde of S. Ambrose, or of any other auncient, learned, and godly doctour, to this purpose: which yet vntill you do, I geue you warninge you do nothinge, that any wise man, or of any iudgement, will regarde.

Howe whereas this treatie is aboute iudginge of controuersies, and you do call vs Heritiques, and call vs to Rome, and to your Tridentine Council there to be iudged, (where we are sure to be condemned, befoze we be heard) you do therein nozwe no moze reasonably, than did the Arians in those daies call the true beleauers in Christe Iesu our Sauour, befoze Arrius, Eusebius, Aurentius: or to the iudgement of the Arriminese Council, which S. Ambrose here saith he did abhorre. If you aske vs how, and befoze what iudges than we will be tried? If we shewe you that we are contented to be tried, as S. Ambrose, here by you alleged, was contented: and in this place here by you alleaged, S. Ambrose hath declared that the vse of the Primitive Church was to procede, will you heare it, will you houlde your selves contented with it? I doubt ye will not. Well S. Ambrose whan he had declared that Aurentius had appointed suche iudges for him, as he was ashamed to name, in this same Epistle hath

hath these wordes. Veniant planè si qui sunt, ad Ecclesiam, audiant cum populo, nō vt quisquam iudex resideat, sed vñusquisq; de suo affectu habeat examen, eligat quem sequatur. Agitur de Ecclesiæ istius sacerdote, si audierit illum populus, & putauerit melius disputare sequatur fidem eius, non inuidebo. Omitto quia iam ipse populus iudicauit: taceo quia enim quem habet, de patre tuæ clementiæ postulauit. &c. that is to say. Let them come in dæde (if there be any suche) to the Church, let them heare with the people: not that any shall sitte as iudge, but that euery one may by his owne affection make examination, and chouse whome he may solowe. the matier is in hande aboute the Bishoppe of this Church, if the people heare him, and shall thinke him to dispute better (than I) let them solow his faith, I will not enuie him: I let it passe that the people them selves haue alreadye iudged: I will not say, that the people asked the Bishoppe, whome they haue, of your clemencies Father: I will not say that your Father promised that all woulde be quiet, if he, who was chosen, shoulde take the Bishoprike vpon him. This faith of your fathers promises haue I solowed. Thus farre S. Ambrose, and shortly after againe he saith: Venissem Imperator ad Consistorium clementiæ tuæ vt hæc coram suggererem, si me vel episcopi vel populus permisissent, dicentes de fidei ecclesia coram populo debere tractari. that is to say. I would haue come vnto your Emperour to your clemencies Consistorie, to haue declared these thinges presently befoze you, if either the Bishops, or people would haue suffered me, sayinge, y<sup>e</sup> treatie of y<sup>e</sup> faith ought to be had in the Church befoze y<sup>e</sup> people. Thus farre S. Ambrose.

He meaneth this Church of Milaine.

Agitur de istius Ecclesiæ sacerdote.

Who

Who declareth the vse of the primitive Church to haue bene, that in controuersies of faith, treatie, and triall, should be had, not befoze the one partie, whiche muste needes be partiall, but befoze the people: whiche vsuage had continued from the Apostles time, who appeared not befoze Annas and Caiphas, and the councill of the Priestes, Scribes, and Pharises, to geue an accompt of their faith, but taught the truth to the people. Nay the Apostles beinge called befoze them, & forbidden to teach: and soze thzreatned if they did teach (as are we now likewise handled by their successours, the Romaine Caiphas, and his Prelates) yet did they teach the people, and gaue an accompt of their faith and hope to the people: all heard, and many solowed them, iudgyng that thei taught the truth. And from the Apostles likewise continued this ordze till S. Ambrose time, and after in the ancient Catholike Church. Let the people heare (saith S. Ambrose) the controuersie of faith: let the treatie of faith be had befoze the people in the Church: let the people examine and chose whome they will solowe: and the pleople (saith he) hath iudged of this matier already. He saith not in any of these places (as say you) let the Pope examine, but euery where, let the people examine. Who haue likewise done as S. Ambrose teacheth vs, and as the Apostles gaue vs example, we haue not gone to the Romaine Caiphas and his Consistorie, taught by the examples of those, who wente, and came not againe, being not heard but burned: we haue gone to the people, who haue heard vs, and haue suffered vs to returne againe: all haue hearde vs, many (as it was in S. Ambrose time) haue chosen to solowe vs, many haue iudged already, that we are no hæretikes, but that

Ambrosi<sup>o</sup> vnus  
quisque eli-  
gat quē sequa-  
tur &c.  
Iā ipse populus  
iudicauit. &c.

that you are enemies and persecutours of the truthe, and therfore haue forlaken you, and fledde from you, and ioyned with vs. And yet you, who alleage S. Am-  
 brose against vs, crie out against vs, will you make the foolish and inconstant vulgare people iudges in causes of faith, and Religion? we answere: we doo know that the vulgare people are blamed of foolishnes, lightnes, and inconstancie. And that they are the moze iustlie blamed therfore, is longe of the Pope and his Prelates, who by all meanes possible haue labored to kepe Goddes people in all ignozance of his holy lawe, and will, and voide of all god iudgement, that they thereby might the moze easely vse their tirannie ouer them and abuse them, like brute beastes. Howbeit we say not *Vulgus*, but *Populus*, not the vulgare people, but the people, as said S. Ambrose, and he that saith the people, meaneth not onely the vulgare people: this worde *Populus*, people, conteineth wise men, learned men, godly men, counsellors, magistrates, yea the Prince him selfe. Before this people do we auouch to proue you enemies, and persequitours of the truth, and haue so proued it alreadie, that a great parte of this people, not onely of the vulgare, but of the best sorte, haue alreadie iudged it to be so: and haue therfore forlaken you. You crie out still, that none of the people, learned or vnlearned, godly or vngodly magistrate, nor priuate person, Prince nor subiect, nor all these together are competent Iudges in controuersies of faith, betwene the Pope and his swozne Cleargie on the one side, and vs poze men on the other: but that the sayde Pope and his Consiatorie onelie are competent iudges, why than are neither you, nor

Hofius lib. 2.

Populus.

Ambrosius.  
Iã ipse populus  
iudicauit.

Z

we,

we, either plainctiues, or defendantes, but you are both iudges, and witnesses, and we cōdemned men, we haue our iudgement alreadie before we be herde. But this is not S. Ambrose iudgement, this is not the Apostles iudgement, it is not Peters, but Caiphas his iudgement, to be iudge in his owne cause, wherein he is partie. To conclude I trust good Reader, thou doest vnderstande, that S. Ambrose in all this proceſſe doth reprove the manour, whiche Valentinianus the Emperour would haue vsed in iudgeing ouer Bishoppes, in causes of faith: that is, that he beinge yonge, vnlearned, vnchristened, guided by the Arrians, who were the one partie, without assistance or counsel of any indifferent, & godly person, should not call Bishopps before him to his consistorie, & there him selfe, or by some wicked lay men his deputies, of whom (as saith S. Ambrose) some might be Iues, or Infidelles, geue sentence against learned and godly Bishopps, in the highest point of our faith, plainly declared in the Scriptures, whiche was not to be called into question, much lesse to be iudged by any, & specially suche. But had the saide Valentinian bene a wise, & godly Prince, S. Ambrose who admitteth any of the people into the Church, to heare disputacions in causes of faith & Religion, and to chōse whome they will folowe, would neuer haue excluded the godly and wise Prince, for that he was a lay man, from that, wherein to be admitteth any of the people, beinge also lay men. And that S. Ambrose, who saith, let the people heare the treatises of faith, to be had in the Church before them, let euery one of the people examine and chōse whome they will folow, and saith that the people hath iudged alreadie: the same S. Ambrose who hath so saide  
 of

of the people, would not mislike that the godly Prince  
 the head of the people, the magistrate, learned, wise,  
 and godly, that is the shoulders, best, and hert of the  
 people, should heare treaties of the faith, should exa-  
 mine and chose whome they may folow: and to folow  
 without iudgement, were but to folow blindly, and to  
 go out of the way, wherfoze it foloweth that they may  
 also accoordinge to Goddes worde, iudge whome they  
 may folow in the saide matier, specially being a matier  
 to them belonging, and touchinge their owne very sal-  
 uation or dampnation: whiche to credite to these Pa-  
 pistes (specially vpon suche experiance of their doinges)  
 without all care, examination, triall, or iudgement, (as  
 they would haue it) were the parte of men to dissolute,  
 and carelesse of their owne health.

Dorman. Folio. 23.

And finally S. Ambrose tolde Valentinian that if he shoulde  
 give him such counsell, or beinge vnmindfull of that right which  
 belongeth to priesthood, committe that to other, whiche God had gi-  
 uen to him, that he should not then treade in the vpriight pathes of  
 truth and simplicitie, but walcke in the crooked way of adulation  
 and flatterie, and that at the length he should (he doubted not) him  
 selfe, as he giue we to more ripenes in yeeres, well vnderstand what  
 manner of Bishop that were: that woulde submitte the auctoritie  
 of Priestes to the iudgement of lay men.

Our coun-  
 trefeite Bi-  
 shops pro-  
 ued true  
 flatterers  
 by S. Am-  
 brose.

Hofius lib. 7.  
 fol. 39. a.

Nowell.

That, whiche you here bringe in finally, is in S.  
 Ambrose placed before your former places: but you  
 do delight in confoundinge and obscuringe of the old  
 Doctors sayings. To the matier I haue said: that

Z 2

none

none of our Bishoppes do committe to Princes or o-  
 ther, that right, whiche belongeth to Priesthode: nei-  
 ther submitte they the authozitie of Priestes in preach-  
 inge, bindinge and losinge, and ministeringe of the  
 Sacramentes, to the iudgement of Lay men, but to  
 the iudgement of Goddes worde: and therefore is your  
 marginall note againste them as flatterers, for the  
 sayinge or doinge of that, whiche they neuer said, nor  
 did, vtterly in vaine. It shalbe to the purpose, out of  
 the places of S. Ambrose by M. Dozman here alleas-  
 ged, truelie to note, what maner of men the Arrian  
 Priestes, and others about Valentinian were, whome  
 S. Ambrose calleth flatterers: and therby to iudge how  
 lustly M. Dozman hath charged our Bishops with fla-  
 terie, as being like to them. S. Ambrose witnesseth that  
 as they did beare y<sup>e</sup> Praince in hand, that al thinges were  
 lawfull for him, that all thinges were his owne: that he  
 had imperial authozitie ouer Goddes matiers, that he  
 should auauance him selfe, and not to be subiecte to God,  
 should thinke his law to be aboue Gods law, should not  
 yelde to God, that whiche is Gods, and hould him selfe  
 contented with that, that belongeth to a Prince: they  
 woulde haue had vnlearned, wicked, vnchristned, lay  
 men, and peradventure Iues, or Infidels, to be iudges  
 ouer learned, and godly Bishoppes, in the highest poin-  
 ces of our faith: as for example, of the diuinitie of our  
 Saniour Iesus Chziste ( for that is the cause of faith,  
 here spoken of ) they woulde haue such lay men to teach  
 godly Bishoppes their dueties, and to dispute of Reli-  
 gion, the Bishoppes houlding their peace would haue a  
 sponge, vnchurche, vnchristned Prince, infected with he-  
 resies, & guided by heretiques, to take vpon him selfe,  
 without

AAmbr. epist. 33.

Allegatur Im-  
 peratori licere  
 oia, ipsius esse  
 vniuersa &c.

b & Hosius li. 1.  
 fol. 39. 2.

Noli grauare  
 Imperator vt  
 putes te in ea  
 qua diuina sunt  
 imperiale ali-  
 quid ius habere.

c Ambrosius li.  
 5. epistola. 32.

Ne forte etiam  
 Gentilis esset a  
 liquis aut Iuda-  
 us, q ab Auxen-  
 rio esset electus,  
 quibus tradere-  
 mus de Christo  
 triumphum. si  
 de Christo iudi-  
 cium committere-  
 mus &c. quid il-  
 lis aliud potest  
 placere, nisi (q  
 absit.) vt Christi  
 Diuinitas dene-  
 getur,

without all aduise or assistance of the godlie learned of the Cleargie, the iudgement ouer suche learned and godlie Bishoppes, in suche high causes of our Religion: or at the suggestion of heretiques, to appointe such Lay men (as I haue out of S. Ambrose before noted) to be iudges therein. And not onely Lay men, did make such wicked suggestions to the yonge Prince, but also the Arian Bishops and Priestes them selues, vnmindfull of the right of Priestes, would committe that to the Prince, whiche God had geuen to Priestes, and like naughtie Bishoppes, would throw the right of Priestes vnder Lay men. Against suche should Iohannes haue alleaged S. Ambrose (if any suche be, whiche God forbid should be) not against them, who teach no such things. Suche were those courtiers and Priestes: suche I confesse, (for of suche speaketh S. Ambrose) if they were Bishoppes, were counterfeit Bishoppes: and Bishops, or not Bishoppes, they were trulie crooked flatterers. And so let M. Dozman call our Bishoppes, whan he can proue that they make any suche suggestions, teache, or mainteine any suche thinge. But I know that they do fully agree with S. Ambrose, that no suche thing is to be taught, or suffered: and that therefore not S. Ambrose, with whom they do agree, but M. Dozman doth call them flatterers: who might by as good right, call S. Ambrose flatterer; as them, fully agreeing herein with him.

Ambros. lib. 3.  
Epist. 32. 33.

Dorman. Fol. 23.

After I saie of these persuasions, he founde that good Emperour so well reclaimed, that him self reports of him in an epistle which he wrote to Theodorus, that where before he persecuted him, now he loued.

Hof. li. 2. f. 119. b  
hath the same  
word for word.

loved him: where before he tooke him for his most all enemye, nor we he reuerenced him as his father. VVhiche (s. Ambrose neuer yielding in his or rather Gods right) the Emperour would neuer vndoubtedly haue doen, had he not well knowen that s. Ambrose was in the right and he in the wrong.

No well.

That s. Ambrose was in the right, and Valentinian in the wrong, we do graunt, as hath bene before declared: and in al that matter, we be of the same mind that s. Ambrose was. But whyles you goe about to doo s. Ambrose, a Bishop in deede worthy of all true commendation, to muche right, onely for that he was a Bishop, and withall, doo that mosse wyse and vertuous Emperour Theodosius, for that he was a Prince, and no Priest, to muche wronge: you doo not well therein

a Lib. 5. epist. 34  
b Lib. 5. cap. 15.  
c Lib. 2. cap. 17.  
Hof. li. 2. f. 119. b

s. Ambrose him selfe, b Theodozetus, and c Rufinus in their histories Ecclesiasticall, and Hostius your author, out of whom you haue stoulen this whole treatie, doo all thre ioyntly geue the chiefe praise of the conuersion of this yonge Prince from the wronge to the right, vnto the Emperour Theodosius. Firste s.

Ambros. 5. epist.  
34. Ad Theod.  
Imperatorem.

Ambrose writting to the Emperour Theodosius, sayth: Valentinianus Augustus informatus fide, ac tuis institutis, tantam deuotionem erga Deum nostrum induerat, atque tanto in me incuberat affectu. &c. that is to say: Valentinian the Emperour informed in the

Tuis institutis.

faith, and your instructions, had taken vpon him so great a deuotion toward our God, and so great loue toward me, that whom before he did persecute, now we he

Hof lib. 2. Contra  
Erenium  
fol. 112. b.

did loue &c. The same wordes hath your Hostius, which you haue gullfully left out, to hide s. Emperour Theodosius his praises: playng at once both the translatour and

and corruptor. And again saith S. Ambrose. Quas clementiæ tuæ gratias deferebā, quod eum nō solū regno reddidisses, sed etiā quod est ampli⁹ instituisse hō dei & pietatis tuæ disciplina. that is: what thanks did I geue vnto your clemencie, for that you had not onlie restored him vnto his kingdome, but also that, whiche is moze, you had instructed him with the learninge of faith and godlines. Thus farre S. Ambrose. And Rufinus in his Ecclesiasticall histoꝛie declareth, that Theodosius the Emperour not onely deliuered this Valentinian the yonger, from the tyrannie of Maximus, and restored him to his kingdome: but also restored the Catholike faith, whiche was by the saide yonge Princes wicked mother violated, and corrupted. Loe D. Dorman, Theodosius the Emperour not onely the restorour of the yonge Emperour Valentinian, and teacher of the right faith to him, but also the restorer of the catholike faith almoste ouerthrowen. This beinge thus, what meained you to conceile the worthy praise of this most godly Prince Theodosius: were you afrayed lest it shuld be knowen, y a Christiā Prince had priuately been a teacher of the faith to others, & had restored the catholike faith and true Religion publikely: whiche is the office of the Supreme governour of Christes Church here in earth: I doe not enuie S. Ambrose praise, I knowe him worthy of moze praise, than both you, and I can geue him. But yet I praise you, let Christian Princes haue their due, and deserued prayles, as well as Priestes: for so becometh you, so often complaining of the beauen dealing of others. And here Hosius your authour, teacheth you better than you doe. But though you conceile the due prayles geuen by S.

Ambrose,

Theodoret. li. 9.  
cap. 15. hath the  
like.  
Rufin. li. 2. ca. 17

Theodosi⁹ fidem  
catholicā, quam  
impia mater Valentiniani violauerat, & regnū restituit.

Ambrose, that learned & holy Bishop, to Emperours: I will not counceile the due praises geuyn by him in this place by you alleaged, to true Bishoppes. S. Ambrose being accused as a tyraunt, hath amōgest many others these wordes: Quid moraretur ferire si tyrannum putaret. &c. that is to say: why did he (saith S. Ambrose) stay to strike, and kill me, if he thought in deede that I was a Tyraunt? By the ould Law, Emperours were geuyn, but not vsurped of Priestes: and it is commonly saide, that Emperours haue moze desired priesthood, than Priestes Empire. Christ fled, that he shuld not be made a king. We haue tyranny, the tyrannie of a Priest, is weakenes. When I am weake (saith S. Paule) than am I mightie &c. and shortly after he saith againe. Addidi quia nunquam Sacerdotes tyranni fuerunt, sed tyrannos sepe sunt passi. I said further (saith S. Ambrose) that Priestes were neuer tyrauntes, but they haue often suffered tyrauntes.

Thus farre S. Ambrose, truely praysinge true Bishops, suche as were befoze, and in his time: no vsurpers, no desirers of empires, kingdomes, and dominions, the folowers of Christ, the fier of worldly kingdoms, and dominions, strong onely in weakenes, and humilitie, neuer playng the tyrauntes, but ofte suffering them. From the whiche example of true Bishops, howe farre that pretended Vicar of Christ, and his counterfeit popishe Prelates, most greedie desirers, moste false vsurpers of worldly kingdomes, & dominions, not folowing Christ in flyng from them, but in folowinge them, flyng from Christ: not weike, not humble, but strong, proude, and dreadfull euē to the greatest power of this worlde: not suffering, but them selues playnge the most

Lib. 5. Epist. 33.

This is when  
Prophetes were  
by Gods speciall  
cōmaundement  
sent to anoint  
kings.

the most terrible tyrauntes, exceedinge in crueltie all  
 Nerons Domitians, Dioclessians, and all others insa-  
 mouslie famous tyrauntes, and bloudsuckers, is to all  
 the world so well known.

Dorman. Fol. 23.

What should I here alleage the woordes of Basilius the Empe-  
 perour, who being present at the eight synode, the fourth of Con-  
 stantinople, made there a notable oration, in the whiche to the laitie  
 he used these woordes: De vobis autem laicis. &c. Of you that  
 are lay men whether you be suche as haue dignities in the common  
 weale or none: I haue no more to saie, but that in no wise it is law-  
 full for you to dispute or reason of causes Ecclesiasticall. For to search  
 out those thinges it belongeth to the patriarches, the Bishoppes and  
 the Priests, who haue received the office to rule, who haue the power  
 to sanctifie, to lose and to binde, in whose handes are the Ecclesiasti-  
 call and heauenly keyes: not vnto vs who must be fedde, who haue  
 neede to be sanctified, to be bound and to be released from our bandes.  
 For the lay man, of how great deuotion and wisdom soeuer he be,  
 ye although he haue all the vertue that is possible to be in a man: yet  
 whilest he is a laie man, he is in the place of a shepe.

Translated worde  
 for word out of  
 Hos. li. 2. fo. 118.  
 In octaua Syno-  
 do, qua fuit Co-  
 nstantinopolitana  
 quarta interfuit  
 Basilius Impera-  
 tor, &c..

No Well.

You do very well to aske your selfe the question:  
 what should I alleage Basilius the Emperours woordes? For  
 sure other reason to alleage them, but because Ho-  
 sius hath alleaged them, haue you none, vnlesse it may  
 please you to answer your question your selfe, by your  
 owne woordes thus: Because I minde to keape me within the  
 limittes and terme of yeeres appointed to me: These are your  
 woordes, shewing you will alleage none authoritie but  
 of suche fathers, and hystories, as were within the first

Hosius fol. 118.

Dorman post.  
 fol. 51. a.

A a fire

five hundred yeeres after our Saviour Christ (soz that is the terme of yeeres you doo speake of) whiche you do well here obserue : seing this Basilus the Emperour liued not within eight hundred and. 60. yeeres after Christ at y least, & an inche bzaketh no square w you.

Further, this eight Synode the fourth at Constantinople is so certen, that which of. iij. Synodes, neere together there assembled, and one cleane contrary to an other, should be this eight generall countell, that you do speake of, the authozs, who do write of it can scarcely tell, and it is of suche authozitie, that Frier Crabbe, the gatherer of all counsels, general, & others, wold geue it no place in his. iij. great tomes of councels, but left it out cleane, as vawozthy of any place at all. How much the moze meete euidence it is for y declaratiõ of your right. And you had so good liking of this euidence your selfe, that showing vs befoze very plainly, where in the Tomes of the counsels you had your expurgation of Pope Sixtus, you dare not tel vs, where you had this, suche stuffe it is. And as this euidence of it selfe is naught, so haue you by cæcelig of a great part of it, made it worse, suche as it is, Hosius hath moze truely reported it by these wordes. *Nulla modo vobis (laicis) licet de Ecclesiasticis causis sermonẽ mouere, neq; pœnitius resistere integritati Ecclesiæ, & vniuersali synodo aduersari. Hæc enim inuestigare & querere Patriarcharum, Pontificum, & Sacerdotum est.* &c. that is to saye : It is in no wise lauffull for you Lay mē to moue any talke of causes Ecclesiasticall: neither vtterly to resist the integritie of the Church, and the vniuersall Synode. For to searche out those things belongeth to Patriarkes, Bishoppes, and priestes, and so furth. *¶* Dozman leaueth quite out these wordes, *Neq; pœnitius resistere integritati Ecclesiæ.* &c. *Neither altogether*

Lib. 2. fol. 118.

Sermonem mouere.

Pœnitius resistere integritati Ecclesiæ.

gether to resist the integritie of the Church, & goeth on smoothly as though there were no suche wordes at all: fearing some padde in that strawe. If we shuld doe the like, all mens eares wold be filled with outcries. Let **D. Dozma** therfoze first proue y<sup>e</sup> integritie, that is to say, the wholenes and soundnes of their Romishe Church (in y<sup>e</sup> which from the head to the heele is no sanitie, but al full of boyles and botches) and the let him at his pleasure alleage this vnlearned Emperours simple saings, as a notable oration: or, as **Hosius** termeth it, a moost godly oratio, against vs. The oration in dede is so notable, that **D. Dozman** durst not translate it, no not so muche of it, as he found in **Hosius**: for he hath left out the most part, and part he hath mollified by translation. That oration teacheth, y<sup>e</sup> a Lay man, be he of neuer so great holines, & wisdome, yea though he excell inwardly in all vertue, yet is it not lausful for him once to moue any speache or talke of causes or matiers Ecclesiasticall: which, **D. Dozman** fearing lest it should seeme incredible, hath translated, *it is in no wise lausfull for any Lay man to dispute or reason of causes Ecclesiasticall.* It teacheth further that a **Bishoppe** though he be muche inferiour in vertue and wisdome to a Lay man: yea though the **Bishop** be naked of all vertue, and full of neuer so muche irreuerence or dishonestie, as long as he is a **Bishoppe**, and preacheth rightly the woorde of truthe, shall suffer no losse of his pastozall name or dignitie. This part though concerninge an excellent prerogatiue for **Bishoppes**, **D. Dozman** durst not for his life touche, but cutte of the matier befoze he came to it, for feare of those wordes, *Donec veritatis verbū rectē prædicauerit*, as long as he rightly preached the woord of truth: vppon conscience

Dor. a notable oration.

Hosius fol. 118. a.  
Basiliij Imperatoris Oratio pijsi-  
ma.

Hos. li. 2. fo. n82

*Quantūcumq; sit  
ep̄s irreuerentia  
plenus & nudus  
omni virtute do-  
nec antistes est,  
& veritatis verbū  
rectē prædica-  
uerit. &c.*

of the continuall lying, and corruptinge of the woorde of truthe, moſte vsuall to his Romiſhe Church. And as he hath cleane leſte out befoze, *Integritati Eccleſiæ, the integrity of the Church*: ſo hath he alter leſte out, *Donec veritatis verbum rectè prædicaverit*, that is: *as long as he ſhall preach the woorde of truthe rightly*: ſeing in thoſe woordes a double exception to his vnſound and vnwhole Church, and to his popiſhe Biſhoppes, corrupters of the woorde of truthe, why the woordes of Baſilius the Emperour could not ſerue his purpoſe. It teacheth further, that many forgetting their owne ozdze, and not remembryng that they be ſecte, will appointe a Lawe to the eſes. This alſo M. Dozman thought god to let alone, as vnfit for him in this place: for though Hoſius reaſoning againſt the comen people, as well as Princes, as vnmeet to medle in matters of Religion, might in reſpecte of the people, vſe the terme of ſecte, yet M. Dozman did ſee he could not well vſe it here, againſt Chriſtian Princes: though befoze, forgetting him ſelſe, he ſaid the ſecte would preſume to be the head. Moreouer, I thinke he did ſcarſly like it, that the Biſhoppes are here (by Hoſius owne confeſſion) compared to the eſes, whiche are not the head, but in the head. And therefore ſhall M. Dozman hardly cõclude by this notable ozation, his preſent propoſition, *that the head of the Church muſt needes be a prieſt*, he might moze eaſely conclude that the eſe of the Church muſt needes be a prieſt. And Baſilius here rekeninge firſt Patriarkes, than Biſhops, and that by the woorde Pontifices, & loſt of al Prieſtes, al in the plural numbze, without any vniverſal patriarke, or pōtifex Maxim⁹ firſt named, geueth a great ſuſpition that none ſuche was

Dor. ſup. fol. 16.

was known in his time, eight hundredth yeres after  
 Christ. And Hosius also vnwares, I thinke, maketh the  
 matier worse by alleaginge these wordes of the Sole-  
 tane counsell: Dum secundum carnis assumptæ my-  
 sterium ecclesiæ suæ, fuerit dignatus caput existere  
 Christus, merito in membris eius, intentio episcopos-  
 rum officia peragere cernitur oculorum, y is to say:  
 Seing accordyng to y mysterie of his humanitie assup-  
 ted, Christ hath vouched saufe to be y head of his church,  
 emongst the membres of the same, worthily is the in-  
 tention or diligent hâde of the Bishoppes, accompted  
 to do the offices or bueties of the eyes. Here Christe is  
 declared to be the head of the Church, and Bishoppes  
 to be the eyes and therefore not the head: contrary to  
 your present proposition. If M. Dozman will say,  
 though some Inferiour Bishoppes be the eyes, yet the  
 Bishoppe of Rome, the chiefe Bishoppe, and Bishop of  
 of Bishops, may be the head, he may say so: but he shall  
 neuer be hable to proue it. And will you see, howe Ho-  
 sius was here ouersene, who carefull to proue that Bi-  
 shoppes (beinge now a daies very blinde of sight) were  
 the eyes in the bodie of Christes Church, thinkinge he  
 had well thynen, if he could obtaine so muche, doth by  
 alleaginge, further of S. Augustine, who calleth the  
 holy Apostles eyes, vnwares proue that no Bishoppe  
 can be moze than an eye, seeinge no Bishop can be grea-  
 ter than the holy Apostles. Whiche allegation of Ho-  
 sius, that the Apostles be eyes, occasioned me sekinge  
 further, to finde that S. Augustine saith, that Peter  
 him selfe also, (by whome the Pope claimeth to be head)  
 was an eye in the heade, and so consequently not the head.  
 But M. Dozman wiser than Hosius herein, commeth

8. Cœcil. Tolet.  
cap. 4.

Hosius lib. 23.  
118. b. ex Au-  
gust. in Psal. 87.

Tract. 13. in Io-  
hannem.

Petruserat oculi  
in capite.

néere none of all this geare , but dissemblinge so many notable things in this notable oration of Basilus, (as he calleth it) whē he had brought the lay man, be he neuer so deuout, holie, vertuous, and wise, into the place of a sheepe , there leauinge him like a sheepe standinge, he goeth his way: thinkinge that this similitude of the sheepe , resemblinge the Lay man , as the sheperde the Priest, will képe the Readers , specially if they be any thinge sheepish in vnderstanding, in such a manering, that they will thinke that lay men, though neuer so holie, vertuous, and wise, for of such lay mē speaketh Basilus in this place , may finde no moze faulte with a Priest, though bare of all vertue, and full of all vice (for of such Priestes speaketh this place) thā may the sheepe with the sheperde. Yea, and that if such Priestes should preache to suche lay men, false doctrine, to the poysoning of their soules, yet should thei haue no moze vnderstandinge thereof, nor power to sie it, than sheepe: but must beleaue, and solow it, euen as the sheepe must, and will be ordered by their sheperdes, though they would driue them to poisoned pastures : and though thousandes of them die of the rotte, yet thei not at al to vnderstand it. Yea to be so sheepishe , that though the hyzelinge sheperdes , do continually kill , and murdre the sheepe, yet must they thinke them god sheperdes, & defendours of the flocke . But Hosius is better to vs than so, who for this similitude of sheperdes and sheepe, doth alleage amongst other these wordes of S. Basill, euer in this place of the treatie of this Oration, here by M. Doorman alleged. The wordes are these: Vos oues nolite pascere pastores, neq; super terminos eorū eleuimini: scis enim est vobis si rectè pascimini. &c. that is to say:

You

You shepe (speakinge to the people) doe not you fede your shepardes, neither liste vp your selves above their limittes: for it is enough, for you, if ye be well fedde. Thus farre, and much moze S. Basil. Which I maruel Dorman did not also alleage, and ioyne Facilius the Emperour and the Bishoppe together, as doth Hosius: for there is much that maketh for sheperdes, iudges, heads, &c. I thinke these wordes recte pascimini, staied him. But thanks be to S. Basill, that geueth the Christian shepe so much skill, as to vnderstande w<sup>h</sup>en they be by their pastour well fedde. Which, vntill you proue that your Romishe depastours haue done, vntill you proue the integritie of your Church, the true preaching of the word of truth by your popishe Bishops, knowe ye that you shal in vaine alleage against vs the notable Orations of either Basilius that vnlearned Emperour, or of Basilius that most learned godly Bishoppe, or of any other auncient godly fathers: some parte of whose sayinges will euer plainly proue, that they speakinge of Pastours, neuer ment of such depastours, and shepe w<sup>h</sup>erars as you are.

Dorman. Fol. 23.

Herherto Basilius the Emperour, to whome I might ioyne bothe the doinges and sayinges of many other, were it not that euen of those earthly rulers who haue beene tyrantes and persecutors of the Christians, we want not yet examples to beate downe these beastly flatterers with all. Emongst a nombre of the whiche that might be here brought, I shall for this time be contented to alleage onely three: Gallio the proconsul of Achaia, Theodoricus Kinge of the Gothes, and Aurelianus the Emperour of Rome. Of whome the firste although he were an infidell, yet refused he to heare the accusations layde at Corinthum against S. Paule, and  
saied.

said in plaine wordes: Ego iudex horum esse nolo, I will not take on me to iudge in these matters, because the accusation concerned Religion where with he had nothinge to doo. The seconde although an Arrian; yet would not presume to be present at a certaine counsell of Bis hoppers whereunto he was called, but modestly excusinge him selfe, made this answer: that in matters of the Church he had nothing to doo, but onely to beare towards them his reuerence. The thirde beinge an ethnike and of the Christians a cruell persecutor, when the Catholike Bis hoppers who had excommunicated the heretike Paulus Samosatenus, and deprived him of his Bis hoprike, resorted to him for his helpe touching the removinge of the saide Paulus out of the mansion house belonginge thereto, the possession whereof he then kepte: woulde not take vpon him the knowledge of this matter where Bis hoppers were parties, but referred the iudgement thereof to the Bis hoppers of Italie and Rome.

In. 4. fin  
Rom.  
Simachi  
papa.  
In Chu  
matters  
what th  
Prince  
to doo.  
Aurelia  
Euseb.  
eccle. h  
cap. 26.

No Well.

**M.** Dozman by a pretie figure saith he will omitte y sayinges of other Christian Princes (whereof he hath plentie) and will proue his matier euen by tirauntes & persecutours of the Christians. Now surely **M.** Dozman all wise men will thinke you doo flie to such scellie shiftes, not for plentie, but for great scarcitie of god prouises. For, what iudgement could such men be of in Religion, that their Testimonies or doinges should be of any authoritie, whome, by the very titles, that you do adourne them withall, you do declare to haue bene boide of right iudgement: Whereby, not your floze (as you do bragge) but your extreme lacke and beggerie is bewrated to the eyes of al me. But what should you do, but alleage such examples, sagge & ragge, as you foud in your authour Hosius, from whome you can not de-  
parte

Translate out  
of Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. 20. b.

Tyrauntes and  
persequeters of  
the Christians.

Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. no. 21.

parte one foote, fauing in chaungeing of y<sup>e</sup> ordze of your  
 fteppes, by setting the left foote foze ward, whā he doth  
 the right, els you treade alwaies in his fteppes: as here  
 in alleaging these examles of Theodoricus & Aurelia-  
 nus together, as he doth, putting in yet for some varietie,  
 Gallio y<sup>e</sup> proconsull in fteede of Hūmericus with Ho-  
 ſus, like a learned man. But to examine these woꝛthie  
 witnesſes of yours. Firſt concerning Gallio the procons-  
 ull, it was of no Religion oz reuerence y<sup>e</sup> he abſteined  
 from the iudgement of thoſe matiers, which the Iues  
 bzought befoze him againſt S. Paule, but of contempt Act. 18.  
 doeth he reiect both the Iues, & their matiers from him,  
 ſayinge: as the hiftozie ſhoweth, I will not be iudge of  
 quæſtiōs about woꝛdes & names, loke you to ſuch ma-  
 tters your ſelves: & ſo he draue them from the Iudgemēt  
 ſeate: which bilike M. Dozman thinketh he did of mode-  
 ſtie, conſcience, and reuerence to them & their matiers.  
 Yea and where thei fel to boffeting one an other befoze  
 the iudgement ſeate, & Gallio as the ſtozie ſaith, cared  
 for none of all theſe thinges: all this bilike he did of re-  
 uerence & conſcience, as M. Dozman ſpeaketh, & not of  
 māere contempt, as the holy hiftozie plainly ſhoweth.  
 For who were they, whome y<sup>e</sup> Proconsull biddeth loke  
 to ſuch matiers them ſelves? forſoꝛth a ſozte of Kaſchall  
 bacabound Iues, y<sup>e</sup> were at Cozinth, whome bilike, vpo  
 Gallio his teſtimonie, M. Dozman thinketh to be mā-  
 ter Iudges in matiers of Religion, than Princes: for  
 ſure y<sup>e</sup> place of the Actes maketh mention of none other, Act. 18.  
 y<sup>e</sup> ſtoꝛde againſt Paule, & whome the proconsul had loke  
 to ſuch matiers them ſelves. For, Criſpus y<sup>e</sup> chiefe ruler  
 of the Synagoge belæued in Chriſte, & was on Pauls  
 ſide, & Sothhenes an other ruler of the Synagoge, was

of smal reputation & litle regarded of Gallio, who beyng well buffered, as the hystorie sheweth, Gallio passed nothing thereof. But had the chiefe Priestes, & Princes of the people of the Iues stande against Paule before Gallio (as thei did before the presidentes Felix and Festus) I thinke Gallio would haue heard them & Paule, as well as Felix and Festus did. And here I pray you note M. Dozmans argument. Gallio the proconsull a Pagaine, of contempt reiected a sort of rascall Iues accusing S. Paule: Ergo, Christian Princes may not medle with matiers of Religion. And if this example of Gallio the proconsull reiecting a sorte of rascall Iues, with their matters from his iudgement seate, doeth in M. Dozmans iudgement, make so much against Princes, as no competent iudges in matiers of Religion: I would learne why the examples of Felix & Festus presidentes of Iurie, admitting before their iudgement seat y<sup>e</sup> high Priest with other Priestes, & with the Scribes & Pharisees, al men of the Cleargie, the head and bodie to of the Cleargie, and hearinge, and examininge their matiers laid against S. Paule: (whiche were concerning Religion) why do not these examples I say, as well, yea and much moze make for Princes, as competent iudges in religio: For, are not towe so notable exāples, as large euidence as one: & is it not as good euidence for Princes authozitie, that the high Prieste and other of the Cleargie, stode to be tried before Felix and Festus presidentes, as it is against Princes authozitie, y<sup>e</sup> Gallio the proconsull of contempt reiected a sorte of varabound Iues, from the iudgement place: Yea I will say yet further euen in the same matier: y<sup>e</sup> S. Paule being offered by the president Festus to be tried before y<sup>e</sup> high Priest,

and

AC. 24. 25.

AC. 25.

& other the Iuifh Cleargie (who by M. Dozmanns iudgement were his cōpetent iudges as men of the Church, in Church matters) yet he refusinge them, appealed to the Emperour from them. Is not this I pray you, good M. Dozman, a better, moze naxer, and apter proufe for Princes, & againſt your high Prieſt & cozrupt Cleargie, ſuche as was that high Prieſt with his Cleargie, than is your example of Gallio, or any other you can bring to the cōtrary? And I would be full loth, that you had any againſt vs, ſo cleare, & pithie, as is this againſt you. I confeſſe, I like not any Pagine Princes iudgement in matters of Religion: yet am I in conſcience perſuaded, that in ſuch cozruption and partialitie of the Cleargie, as than was, and now is, S. Paule hath geuen vs an example to appeale from them to the iudgement, not onely of Chriſtian, but alſo of Pagine Princes, rather than to be vndoubtedly by ſuch a cozrupt Cleargie moſt vniuſſly oppreſſed, & the truth with vs ſuppreſſed. And withall I truſt, I haue by this and the other examples well proued, that M. Dozmanns proufe of his purpoſe by the proconſull Gallio, is not ſo well to be liked of any wiſe man, as he him ſelf ſeemed to like it, whan he braggeth that he would therewith beate downe theſe beaſtly flatterers: Whereby he hath ſhowed his iudgement and diſcretion to be ſomewhat brutiſhe, ſo blufferingly to bragge of ſo baſe bombardes, and ſlinges, as though they were dable canons, to beate downe main walles withall euen to the grounde.

This ſecond example of Theodozicus is yet moze baſe: whereby he would haue it proued, y a Prince both barbarous, & an heretike, did better know who had to intermedle in matters of Religion, & who not, than the Bi-

shops the selves, who called him thereunto. And whereas *M. Dozma* hath in *Socrates*, *Theodoritus*, & *Sozomenus* so many examples of *Constantius*, *Valens*, & *Valentinian* the yonger, Emperours, who continually intermedled in matters of Religion, & vsed superiouritie over Bishops: if *M. Dozman* doe so delight in the sayinges & doinges of barbarous, & heretical Princes, such as was *Theodoricus*, why should he refuse the examples of the, though fauoringe the *Arrians* heresie, as did *Theodoricus*, yet being *Romaine* Emperours, & therefore to be preferred before a barbarous *Gothian*: His third example of *Aurelianus* the Emperour is yet y<sup>e</sup> basest of al: for the quarell being about the possession of an house, y<sup>e</sup> catholike Bishops, who suede to him thereabout, did wel know y<sup>e</sup> the Prince might well deale therein: els had they vndiscretely made y<sup>e</sup> suite to the Emperour. Pea & he both euidently assigne the Bishops of *Italie* & of *Rome*, to be his delegates to determine y<sup>e</sup> matier, as hauinge authoritie so to doe. For did not I pray you y<sup>e</sup> Bishops of *Italy* & *Rome*, by vertue of y<sup>e</sup> the Emperours comission, put out *Paulus Samosatenus*, & placed Bishop *Domnus*: wherfoze *Eusebius* saith: *Paulus summa cum ignominia per Mundanum principem ecclesia expellitur.* *Paulus* was to his great shame put out of y<sup>e</sup> Church by a *Mundane* or woꝛldly Prince. And yet the storie being thus euident, *M. Dozman* of his accustomed sinceritie & shamefastnes saith of his owne head, y<sup>e</sup> this Prince beinge a *Ethnicke*, & cruell persecutour of *Christians* (& therefore of likelihoode spared not to marther *Christians* mens bodfes) would not (bilske of a scrupulous conscience) take vpon him y<sup>e</sup> knowledge of this great matier touching y<sup>e</sup> possession of an house: so; thus saith *M. Dozma*.

But

*Euseb. li. 7. c. 30.*  
*Aurelian<sup>us</sup> inter-*  
*pellatus conuen-*  
*ientissimè de-*  
*creuit, illis eam*  
*domū adiudi-*  
*cari præcipiens,*  
*quibus episcopi*  
*Italiæ & Romæ*  
*in Dogmate cõ-*  
*cordes scribant.*

But Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical hystozie saith cleane contrary. That the said Pundane Prince put out Paulus: howe would he not than medle in the matter? but belike M. Dozman did knowe better what was saide & done at that time, than Eusebius, soz he doth contrary him not in this poinc alone. For Eusebius declareth Lib. 7. cap. 36. that Aureliane though a Pagan, was than very favourable to the Christians, as this his care about their matter doth manifestly declare. But M. Dozman for amplification sake, thought good, rather than he would lacke his Ampulla, to make one of a lie, saynge, that the Emperour Aurelianus beinge of the Christians, a cruell persecutour, would not take vpon him the knowledge of this matter: where, by Eusebius the truth appeareth, that Aurelianus as than favourable to the Christians, & regarding the appeasing of their controwersies, did take vpon him the knowledge of this matter, & expelled Paulus, & put Domnus in possession, this is the truth. For though, as Eusebius saith, Aurelianus afterward was alienated from the Christians, & intended to persecute the, he was by death prevented, yet whā he dealt in these matters, he was friendly to them, and not as M. Dozman saith, a cruell persecutour of the Christians. This dealing declareth that M. Dozman hath a singular zeale to boult out the truth: which is the end wherunto all true Christians ought to applye their writings, and saynges. There is yet one incommoditie moze in this matter of M. Dozmans: that the other Bishops of Italy are placed before the Bishop of Rome, & that he hath none other name of dignitie, but the Bishop of Rome onely. M. Dozman perhaps will saye, the Pagan Prince did not knowe or remembre the Supre-

Quibus epi Italiae & Romae in dogmate concordantes scribant.

macte of the sea of Rome. Why, but me thinke yet that the authour of the hystorie Eusebius, a Bishop, and so learned a Bishop, would not, or should not haue so placed behind noone the Pope of Rome, had he had any suche knowledge or opinion of his supremacie, as is nowe a daies by M. Dorman, and other suche, so much bragged of. For he had not marred the hystorie, had he said Aurelianus referred the iudgement to the Bishop of Rome, and the Bishops of Italy. And these be those weighty pꝛoufes, for whose sake M. Dorman forsooke his great plentie of other no simple Wuffe, and euidence of importance, as he calet h them, y he might haue a rowme to bring this geare into the face of open Court, as he braggeth he would doe.

Dor, sup. fo. 17. b

Dorman. Fol. 24.

If Heretikes good Readers, tyrantes and Ethnikes, were yet so modest that they would not, or of the wrath of God (which brooseth Psalm. a into sifters the proudest of them all like the sherdes of a potters pot, as continually was represented vnto their eies, by the terrible examples of the two kinges <sup>a</sup> Ozias and <sup>a</sup> Oza) so fearefull, that they durst not with <sup>b</sup> saule cut any part of samuels coate, with <sup>c</sup> Ozias inuade the Priestes office, and straine out of the limites of that iurisdiction whiche God had geuen to them: what may then the kinges and Princes of our age saie, who by thiese furious firebrandes haue bene so farre abused, that they haue not doubted to take on them that, whiche heretikes and miscreantes of conscience haue refused? For this by the way is well to be noted, that as these beinge heretikes and Ethnikes refused to intrude themselves into Ecclesiasticall iurisdiction: so was there neuer Emperour sence first they became Christened, onlesse he were him self an heretike or by heretikes set on, that attempted to doe otherwise: and that immediatly in so doing, what

<sup>a</sup> Borrowed of  
Hos<sup>1</sup> li. 2. f. 75. <sup>a</sup>  
<sup>b</sup> Li. 1. f. 37. 38. <sup>a</sup>  
<sup>c</sup> Li. 2. fol. 63. b.  
54. 2.

*what so euer he were, as he was by heretikes maintained: so by good and Catholike Bishoppes, suche as of whose bothe vertue and learning no mā doubteth, was he both earnestlie and sharply reprovèd.*

*Nowell.*

Loe good Readers after this terrible gonneshotte, and horrible batterie, wherewith as you haue hearde M. Dozman hath beaten downe the beastlie flatterers, now as reason is, he singeth Jō triumphe. It is ridiculous that he alleaging the iudgemētes of these men for his Priestes authoritie, against Princes, doth estones by calling them Hæretikes, Tyrantes, and Ethnikes, declare them to haue lacked their right iudgement, and therfoze to be most meete to be witnesses with him, and to iudge of his side. I dare say, if we should alleage the saynges and doinges of Constantius, and Valens the Emperours, against Priestes, he wold say we did most leudly. But though the papistes being destitute of good witnesses, do seeke the testimonies of Hæretikes, Tyrantes, & Ethnikes, we haue no nēde so to do (thākes be to God therfoze) hauing plentie of examples of godly Princes to proue the truth. It is as ridiculous that he saith, that Hæretikes, Tyrantes, and Ethnikes, either of modestie would not, or of feare of Gods wrath (presented vnto their eies by the examples of the two kinges Ozas and Ozia) durst not, or of conscience refused the intermedling with the matiers, that he hath spoken of. For what elles but modestie, shoulde be in Tyrantes, feare of God in Ethnikes, conscience in Hæretikes, right iudgemēt in them all, if they say, or do any thyng that may seeme to serue M. Dozmanns purpose. Besides that M. Dozmā to make the matier moze ample, maketh of Elias & Za two kinges: one moze thā euer God, or man, but M. Dozman, made.

*Polwa*

A. 8.

Gallio abegit  
eos a Tribunali.  
&c. Et nihil horū  
erat illi curæ.  
Lib. 7. cap. 30.

Howe it is most euident that Gallio of meere con-  
tempt and not of any modestie, conscience, or feare, re-  
fected them and their matiers. And Aurelianus did in-  
deede intermedle in the matter, and as (Eusebius saith)  
crpelled Paulus Samosatenus: so farre of is it, that he  
refused it of any conscience or feare, as M. Dozman fet-  
teth he had therein: who confessinge him to haue been  
an Ethnicke, and cruell persecutour (and therefore not  
sparing to murther both Bishoppes & Christian mens  
bodies) maketh him of a spiced conscience not so bould-  
as to intermedle with a Bishops house. And it is mosse  
creadible, that neither Gallio, nor Aurelianus, both  
being Ethnicks, euer heard of Dias or Dya, to take  
any example by them, or if they had heard thereof, that  
they cared not muche for suche reportes. Wherefore  
M. Dozman may reserue these terrible examples vnto  
a place moze meete, and conuenient for theim: for sure  
here they serue to no other purpose, but to satisfie M.  
Dozmans phantasie, in framing of Hosius phzases af-  
ter his fond fashion. For Hosius hath the same words,  
and like a wittie and learned Papist saith, that Con-  
stantine, Theodosius, Valentinian, Martiane, Justi-  
nian, and other godly Christian Princes, hearing and  
feareing the examples of Dias and Dya punishment,  
durst not intermedle in matiers of Religion: whiche  
woordes though false, yet haue some probabilitie, for  
those Princes as learned in Gods woordes, might heare  
or read thereof: and as godly Princes, might feare  
Gods terrible iudgement. This M. Dozman finding, &  
liking, and purposing to vse the same fashion of phzase,  
now not dreaming, but vtterly doting, bringeth them  
out of al fashion, applyng them to Ethnicks & Ty-  
rauntes,

Hosius. fol. 75. a.

rauntes, whom it is most creadible either neuer to haue heard, or litle to haue cared for any suche examples, in our hystories reported of *Dias* and *Dza*. These grosse suffurations, and carterly conueyaunces can with no cautele be covered, Now to the matter it selfe.

Where as our *Princes* doe no suche thinges as did *Dias*, and *Dza*: *Hosius*, *D. Harding*, and you doe in vaine threate them with the punishmēt of those, whose faultes they be cleare from. None of our *Princes* are guiltie of the tearing of *Samuell* his garment, with king *Saule*, whiche *P. Dozman* calleth cuttinge, and aplieth it to the presuming bypon *Blestes* offices, following, as I thinke, *Damasene*, in the place out of him by *Hosius* alleaged: where as it is by *Samuel* him self, and by *Chrysostome*, and other the best interpreters, aplied as a figure, to the tearing of *Saules* kingdome from him: the cause whereof was, his disobedience to *Gods* comādemēt, & not the tearing of *Saules* kingdome from him: the cause whereof was, his disobedience to *Gods* conimaundement, and not the tearing of *Samuels* coate.

Ho. f. 67. 2. 75. 2.  
D. Hard. Cōfut.  
Apol. fol. 298. 2.  
339. b.

Hof. li. 1. fo. 37. b  
38. a.  
1. Reg. 15. e. 22. f.  
27. 28.  
Chrysoft. in eū  
dem locum.

Concerning straying out of the limites of that iurisdiction whiche God hath geuen them: *P. Dozman* may sing this sōg to his *Pope* and *popishe* *Brelates*, who passing the humble limites of Ecclesiasticall ministerie, haue boldly burst into the proud possession, and vnlaufall vsurping of worldly dominions, expressly in the Scriptures by our *Sauour* to them forbidden. The effect of all this treatie is this: Callio the proconsull an *Ethnicke* gouernour of contempt would not: Ergo, *Christian* *Princes* may not. *Princes* beinge *Haretikes* (and yet he hath brought in but one *Haretike* *Prince*) wold not medle

¶ in ma

in matters of Religion: Ergo, godly Princes may not medle with them. The tyzant Aurelianus wold not. soz to M. Dozman (though falsly) supposeth, Ergo god Princes ought not. These arguments I am sure, wil neuer be framed into any forme of lafull Syllogisme, in any figure or mode, except perhaps it be in Bocardo: soz this Logike was neuer learned in other schole. I might by as good, and better reason bringe in Constantus, Valens, and Valentinian the yonger, Emperours, being continuall superstitie in causes and ouer persons Ecclesiasticall, to proue the authoritie of Princes. But M. Dozman would aunswere me, as he here doth: *thei were Heretikes., or deceiued and sette on by Heretikes, and that therefore it is not to be regarded what they did. Why may one Heretikes sayng serue for Princes pæmi-nence, and a numbze serue nothing for Princes pærogatiue: I say further, Constantine no Heretike, allea-ged also by you, soz your purpose, did intermedle in Bp. Hop Cecilianus & Bishop Felix his causes: did sharply rebuke such bishops as he iudged to be faultie, thzreatnig to punishe them, to depose, and banishe them: which he would not haue thzreatned, vnlesse he had thought it had appertained to his office so to do. Yea and the same Co-stantine at the motion & suite of Athanasius bringe no Heretike, comaunded the whole councell of Bishops assembled at Tyzus, personally to appeare befoze him, and to geue accompt of their doinges befoze him. And no catholike Bishop reppoued him therefore. Wherefoze it is not true that M. Dozman saith: *that there was none Emperour since first they became Christened, that intermedled with Church matters vnles he were him selfe an Heretike, or by He-ретikes set on, and that he was therefore by Catholike Bishoppes earnestly**

August. epist. 106  
Theod. li. 3. ca. 19

Socrat. lib. 7. cap.  
32. 34.  
Sozom. lib. 1,  
cap. 28.

earnestly and sharply reproveth. Valentinian also the first, by you alleaged, being no Hæretike, noꝝ by Hæretike sette on, calleth together Pꝛiestes and Bishoppes, admonisheth them of their dutie, medleth in the election of Bishoppes, summoneth Bishoppes to councelles, dealeth in matters of Religion, condemneth and curseth Bishoppes disobedient. Theodosius that godly Emperour deposed and banished the Arian Bishoppes: and so did many moe godlie Pꝛinces, whiche were no Hæretikes, noꝝ by Hæretikes set on, as I could here reherse. And doe not the examples of these and such other Pꝛinces, no Tyrantes, no Pagans, no Hæretikes, noꝝ by Hæretikes set on, not by catholikes reproveth, make foꝝ Christian Pꝛinces pꝛerogative in Ecclesiasticall matters? Yea so farre of was it, that catholike Bishops reproveth Christian Emperours foꝝ intermedling in matters Ecclesiasticall, that they pꝛovoked and moued them thereunto. All the catholike Bishops assembled at the great councill of Nice, all the catholike Bishops of Hellespōt and Bithinia, assembled at the councill of Lampsa cum ꝛc. acknowledge the Emperour as their iudge, and exhorted him to treate and consult with them in matters of Religion. Yea but the Emperours refused that offer (saith M. Dozman) and they two though Souldiers, and Lay men, did better iudge of the truth in this matter, than all those. 300. and moe learned and Catholike Bishoppes. Well, than I see our cause standeth in an euill case, if M. Dozman may thus ordeine the matter: that Emperours though they be Ethnicks, Tyrantes, oꝝ Hæretikes, if they save oughte that maketh oꝝ soundeth to the aduancement of Pꝛiestes above

Theodor. lib. 4.  
cap. 5. &c. vt sup.  
fol. 78.

Rufin. li. 1. cap. 2.  
Sozom. lib. 6.  
cap. 7. &c.  
Supra. fol. 76. b.  
&c. 77.

Res about Princes, it is of good, and authentique authoritie: but if they doo take vnto them due authoritie ouer Bishops, in commaunding them to doo their duttie, or punishing them not doing their duttie, then be they Heretikes, Tyrantes, or Ethnicks. But be they Christiã Princes, no Ethnicks, god Princes no Tyrantes, Catholike Princes no Heretikes, yet be they of no authoritie, if they take vppon them any authoritie ouer Priestes: as being either set on by Heretikes, or reppoued by catholike Bishops therefore. So the examples of Princes be they good Princes or Tyrantes, Ethnicks or Christians, Heretikes or Catholikes, cã not serue our turne: but good or badd, Ethnicks or Heretikes it sozceh not, they will serue to beate downe these beastly flatterers, that will not suffer Priestes to lead Christian Princes by the noses whither they list. And our case is no better with Bishoppes, than it is with Princes. For, euery severall Bishoppes saynge by M. Dozman alleaged, is of good authoritie to set vppon Priestes about Princes. But if. iij. hundzeth or moe Catholike Bishoppes doo yelde any thinge to Princes concerning the knowledge, and iudgement of their controversies, or dealing in matters of Religion, their iudgement is not woorthy a buttõ: than one Princes iudgement or rather curtesie (though he haue been a souldiar al his life, & had no lesure to looke on bookes of scripture) geuinge place & submitting him selfe to Priestes, is to be preferred not only befoze many Princes of contrary iudgement, but also befoze Bishoppes, be they neuer so many, neuer so learned, neuer so godly Bishops. The case stãding thus (soz thus M. Dozma wil nedes haue) he may wel brag of y<sup>e</sup> sayngs, & doings of the iudgement,

ment, modestie, conscience, and reuerence, that euen ty-  
rauntes, Ethnickes, Hæretiques, and miscreautes, had  
towards Priestes: so feareful men they were, any thing  
to presume about the, or to intermedle in their causes,  
e he may triumphe like a conquerour ouer these downe  
beaten beastly flaterers, who would not haue Christian  
Princes to be, like brute beastes, carelesse of their owne  
saluation, nor of the saluation of the people to their  
chardge committed, nor to trust therewith these popish  
Priestes, either so ignoraunt that they do not know,  
or so malicious that they will not tell any truth, to ei-  
ther Prince, or people.

*Dorman. Folia. 24.*

*Constantius.* And here to beginne with that inconstant Constantius, who of  
a Catholike Emperour became a wicked Arrian: in whose time as  
Socrates reporteth, there were no fewer then nine faithes. VVhen  
he began to take vpon him the parte of Ozias, the Priestes office in  
decidinge questions and matters of Religion, in deposing the catho-  
like Bishoppes and placinge Arrians in their roomes, in prisoning  
some in banis hinge moe, in vexinge and disquietinge all: had not  
God thinke you his Azarias ready to matche with him?

Trãlated word  
for vvoorde out  
of Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. 120. a

*Paralip.  
p. 26.*

*No well.*

That you set this treatie of Constantius nexte go-  
inge befoze the treatie of Theodoricus, and Aurelianus  
in Hosius your authour, by your accustomed Methode,  
next behinde in your treatie, you shew herein acuning  
whiche euery Bachelor hath not. And you do very well  
to beginne with Constantius in the very same wordes  
that Hosius your authour doth beginne with him, and  
so to hould on continually with Hosius, as you haue be-

Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. 120. a.  
Constantius quo-  
nihil in religio-  
ne fuit incon-

CC 3

gonne Constantius.

gonne w<sup>th</sup> him. You do fondly compare together King  
 Drias parte, in offeringe of incense (whiche was the  
 proper office of the Priest, and wherewith the Prince  
 might not medle) with the decidinge of questions, and  
 matiers of Religion (wherewith godly Princes, with  
 the aduise of godly & learned men, specially of the Clea-  
 rgie, haue intermedled) & with displacinge and placinge  
 of Bishoppes: which diuers godly Princes haue often-  
 times done, as shal hereafter plainly appeare. I might  
 by good reason aske of you, who so lately alleaged the  
 sayings and doinges of Princes, who were hereti-  
 ques, Ethnickes, and tyrauntes, for godd authoritie,  
 why you should relect now the doinges of Constantius  
 the Emperour: was he any worse than an Ethnicke,  
 heretique, and tyraunt: But to remitte this matier to  
 you, I do graunt that Constantius both in decidinge of  
 questions and matiers of Religion, (wherein he had no  
 skill) without the aduise of the godly, learned, and al-  
 so in depolinge of godd Bishoppes, and placinge of e-  
 uell in their roumes, did naught. But will you there-  
 fore frame this argument thereof. Constantius the  
 Emperour, wicked, and vnlearned him selfe, did take  
 vpon him to decide questions and matiers of Religion,  
 without any aduise of the godly learned: Ergo, a  
 godly and learned Emperour with the aduise of other  
 godly men of the Cleargie, may not intermedle with  
 decidinge of questions, and matiers of Religion. *Yes*  
*M. Dozman*, you shall finde that suche Princes haue  
 bene the chiefe doers in the decidinge of such questions  
 and matiers of Religion, and so shal hereafter plainely  
 appeare. In the meane time good Reader, I pray  
 the remembze that suche questions and matiers of Re-  
 ligion

Religion may be treated and decided in the Church be-  
 fore the people, by S. Ambrose iudgement, (as hath Lib. 5. epist. 32.  
 bene before declared) the people examininge and choo-  
 singe whome they may follow. And that therefore there  
 is no cause why the godly Prince shoulde be excluded,  
 where the people are admitted: and why the godly and  
 learned Prince may not choise, where the people may.  
 I pray the remembre also, that all the godly Bishoppes  
 of Hellesponte and Bithinia with others, by their Sozomen<sup>e</sup> lib. 6.  
cap. 7.  
 legate Bishoppe, Hypatianus, required the Emperour  
 Valentinian to be present with them, to intreate of  
 certaine pointes of Religion to be reformed: as hath  
 bene before by M. Dorman confessed: who, to avoide  
 that inconuenience hath preferred the iudgement of  
 one lay man the Emperour, before the iudgements  
 of all those godly learned Bishoppes, cleane contrary  
 to him selfe, who will in these matters haue Bishoppes  
 not Princes to be iudges. To procede, Constantius  
 a wicked Emperour without all cause depriued godly  
 Bishoppes, and put wicked in their places. Ergo, say  
 you M. Dorman, (for elles you can say nothing) a god-  
 ly Prince may not vpon iust cause, cause a wicked Bi-  
 shoppe to be deposed, and a godly to be put in his place.  
 Let king Salomon deposing Abiathar the high Priest  
 and placinge Sadocke in his rounge, answer your ar-  
 gument, if it be worthie any answer.

*Dorman. Fol. 24.*

erius. *Was not there first Liberius the Pope, of whom when he (med-  
 dinge in matters of Religion,) most earnestly required, that he would  
 subscribe againste Athanasius, (promisinge on the one side great  
 rewarde,* Translated out  
of Hosius lib. 3.  
fol. 36. b.

Munera pollicitus si fecisset, & supplicia comminatus, nisi paruisset, &c. word for word beginninge and ending iust with Hosius.

rewardes if he did, and threatninge on the other exquisite tormentes if he refused) he receiued this answer. Non ita se habet ecclesiasticus canon, neque vnquam accepimus talem à patribus traditionem. Quod si omnino Imperator curam suam pro ecclesiastica pace interponere quatit, aut scripta à nobis pro Athanasio deleri iubet: deleantur quoque ea quæ contra eum scripta sunt, fiatque deinde ecclesiastica synodus ubi nec Imperator præsto sit, nec Comes se ingerat, nec iudex mineatur. The rules of the Church quoth he teach vs no suche thinge, nor we neuer receiued of our fathers any such tradition. But if the Emperour will needes be carefull in procuringe the peace of the Church, or commaunde that I retract those thinges which I haue written in the behalfe of Athanasius: let them also be called in that haue bene written against him, and let there be after that, an ecclesiasticall synode assembled, far from his palace, where neither the Emperour shalbe present, neither his lieuetenant intrude him selfe, nor iudge threaten.

No well.

**¶** Dozman now he hath (as he thinketh) longe enough piked stozes out of Hosius his seconde booke, lest he should leaue that place cleane bare, leapech backwarde) like an hare that feareth trappers folowing her) into Hosius first booke, and there he gathereth an handfull or twaine, and so returneth where he was againe. But I doe answer Hosius here, as I did answer him befoze, alleaginge likewise by **¶** Dozmanns penne **S.** Ambzoles wordes against Valentinean the Emperour: for the cast is all one. Constantius did the same, that Valentineanus would haue done, Liberius, Hosius Cordubensis, and Athanasius blamed the same doings in Constantius, whiche **S.** Ambzole blamed in Valentineanus beginning to doe like. **¶** Mine answer therefore

Hosius lib. 1.  
Sol. 36. b. & 37. a.

therefore to Hosius alleaginge by M. Dozman S. Ambrose as against vs, may serue to him here alleaginge likewise by M. Dozman, Pope Liberius, Hosius, and Athanasius, as against vs. And when Hosius and M. Dozman can proue that our Christian Princes be such as was Constantius the Emperour, who was both wicked, & an heretique, & that our Princes do such things, and so inordinatly, as he did: than let M. Dozman out of Hosius lay the sayings of these godly men, spoken against Constantius & his doinges, to the charge of our Princes, as like persons, and against their doinges, as the like doinges. Let them do it I say, when they haue proued them like: whiche because they can neuer do, I will proue that our Christian Princes are them selves most vnlike to Constantius that wicked Emperour, & their doinges most vnlike to his dedes: which donne, I trust the reasonable Reader will sone perceiue, that the like sayings of godly fathers, can not in like manner apperteine to persons and dedes most vnlike: and that therefore M. Dozman hath donne like him selfe. And it is to be noted, that where Athanasius in this sentence, here out of Hosius by M. Dozman borrowed, hath these wordes: Neq; vnquam accepimus talem à patribus traditionē, quam ipsi à beato & magno Apostolo Petro acceperunt &c. that is to say. Neither did we euer receiue any such tradition of our fathers, which they receiued of y<sup>e</sup> blessed & great Apostle Peter. These wordes hath M. Dozman left out, as his authour Hosius doeth: which argueth that M. Dozman looked vpon Hosius, & not vpon Athanasius, when he wrote this place. And Hosius of purpose left the out, fearing, as it may seeme, lest these wordes of Liberius, our fathers neuer receiued

Athanas. epistola ad solitariam vitam agentes,

any such traditiō of the holy and great Apostle Peter, might geue men occasion to thinke of our popish traditions, which came neuer nêre S. Peter, nor any other Apostle, by many hundzeth yêres. But specially he lefte them out, for ȳ S. Peter being alleaged here, by a Pope of Rome, is not called Prince of ȳ Apostles, nor head of ȳ church, but the holy & great Apostle: which title is vsually geue to S. Paule also. But it had bêne moze than necessarie, ȳ against Constantius, takinge vpon him to be head of the whole Church, & callinge befoze him Liberius Pope of Rome, as his inferiour, Pope Liberius shoulde haue alleaged Peter, as the head of the whole Church: and so consequently haue exêpted him selfe, as Peters successor, and theretofore head also (as these men reason) of the whole Church, from such apparauce befoze Constantius: and to haue called him, and all those controuersies of Religion, befoze him selfe: for this had bêne a plaine & short way. It wilbe said peradventure, that Liberius befoze such a tyraūt durst not claime his right. Surely Liberius spake these wordes here by D. Dozman alleaged, to one Eusebius a chamberlaine, & gelded man (as appeareth by that processe) who durst at that time haue writen or spoken any thing, that he thought to be true, to the Emperour him self. Neither could he haue offended Constantius moze than he did, had he so saide. And would ȳ god father, which wrote, & saide the trueth in ȳ princippall point of our faith to the Emperour him self, though he thereby most grieuouly offended him, haue left this, so necessarie a thinge, & in a time so necessarie, to be said, vnsaide: And if not to the Emperour, yet to ȳ cowardly gelded chāberlaine, surely would he haue said it, had he thought it to be true. Pay, & in al those cōtro  
uerſies.

nerfles befoze Constantius, it was neuer said by Liberius, or any other Bishop, y<sup>e</sup> the controuersies of Religion, did specially apperteine to y<sup>e</sup> cognition, & deciding, of the Bishop of Rome: but men did call such matters to the knowledge of all godly & learned Bishops indifferently: whiche would neuer haue bene so done, had mē had y<sup>e</sup> opiniō of the Popes supremacie that now is. Peca Liberius him selfe y<sup>e</sup>lding herein, that his owne writings should be called in by the Emperour, so y<sup>e</sup> other contrary writings might likewise be called in, doth seeme to y<sup>e</sup>elde both to the Emperour very much, & also to matche him selfe, as æquall with others, & that done he saith not, let them than resoꝛt to the court of Rome, Peters chaire, there to be tried: (as say these men now a daies) but saith he, let than a fræ counsell be called, and there let Athanasius be iudged, and who so euer els is charged or accused: (not excepting him selfe, who had to do in y<sup>e</sup> matter, & was accused to the Emperour) & let as many, saith Liberius, as can be founde by the counsell culpable, be cast out. Al these things inclosed in the sentence of Liberius, by Hosius alleaged, or ioyned thereto, hath he left out. And M. Dozman could write no moze, than he founde in Hosius, & therfoze you must pardon him. But I wot not what mysterie there is, y<sup>e</sup> he tranſlateth these wordes. Si iubeat Imperator scripta à nobis pro Athanasio deleri. *If the Emperour commaunde that I retract those thinges, whiche I haue writen for Athanasius.*

Liberius ibidē.

fa. 451.

Deinde iudiciū de Athanasio fiat, aut si quis alius reus agitur & quotquot ab ipsis noxij reperti fuerint, ejciantur.

Deleri.

And these wordes. Deleantur quoq; scripta cōtra eū. *Let the writings against him be also called in.* why, I say, where y<sup>e</sup> same verbe deleri & deleantur is vsed in y<sup>e</sup> Latine, y<sup>e</sup> English should be diuers: Is it onely for copie, or thinketh M. Dozman y<sup>e</sup> thinges once not spokē onely, but also writ

Deleantur.

ten by the Pope, may be retracted vpon the Emperours  
 cōmandement: It were good he vsed his copie & eloquence  
 in maters of lesse impoztaunce. Yet hath *D. Dozma* his  
 meaning, that y<sup>e</sup> Emperour should not call in *Liberius*  
 writings, as he did other mēs, but y<sup>e</sup> *Liberius* him selfe  
 as Pope, might onely retract his owne writings, and  
 no man els might meddle with them. But this is the  
 glose, & not the terte, which expressely saith, that the Em-  
 perour should commaunde his writings, as well as o-  
 ther mens to be disanulled. And in orde *Liberius* as  
 here befoze y<sup>e</sup> Emperour, he preferreth not him selfe noz  
 his see, and writings befoze other *Bishops*: so dealinge  
 with other *Bishops* (as namely with *Athanasius*, out  
 of whom this procelle is taken) he sheweth no signe noz  
 token of any præminence in him selfe, or his see, but  
 very many tokens of his æqualitie with other *Bi-*  
*shoppes* doth he showe euery where. But to returne to  
*Constantius*: where it appeareth, partly by those parcels  
 which *D. Dozman* & his authour alleageth here, & here-  
 after of *Liberius*, of *Hollus Cordubensis*, & *Athanasius*,  
 and by that longe treatie of *Athanasius* at large moste  
 plainly, y<sup>e</sup> the Emperour *Constantius* called *Synodes*  
 or cōcils of *Bishops* into his palace, there vsed threat-  
 ning, & force against the godly & learned *Bishops*, which  
 is not the custome of good Princes, but the violence &  
 oppression of cruel tyzauntes: the wordes of *Liberius*,  
 let a councell be assembled farre from the Palace, where  
 neither the Prince (vsinge suche violence) nor the in-  
 strudnge Lieutenant, noz the threatninge iudge shalbe  
 present, do nothing appertaine to our Princes, calling  
 no Councelles of *Bishops* into their Palaces, nei-  
 ther them selves, noz their Leutenantes or iudges,  
 either

*Liberis* epist. ad  
*Athanasium*.  
 Tomo. 1. *Ahan.*  
 fa. 82. Si mecum  
 sētis, quæso sub-  
 scribas &c.  
 ruaque mādata  
 inhaſtitanter  
 obeam &c.

either intruding, enforcing, or threatening them. And where P. Dozman by alleaging this saynge of Pope Liberius against Constantius, would bear the world in hande, that our Princes are in these pointes like to Constantius, they are the moze bounden to him therefore. And where he would also haue y simple Readers of this place of Pope Liberius, forbidding Hæretikes, and wicked Princes, intruding leaueleanantes, threatening Judges, to be at coucels to learne this ledd lesson that no Princes, Leaueleanaunt, nor Judge may be present in a counsell of Bishoppes: Constantius the great (alwayes great in vertue and godlines, as well as in dominions) present and busilie occupied with the Bishoppes at the first great holy general Nicene counsell: Theodosius the Emperours doinges at the second counsell at Constantinople, and his Embassadour Candidianus, being present for him at the thirde counsell at Ephesus, Martianus the Emperour present at the fourth counsell Chalcedonense, will teache them that list learne the truth, to take surth a contrarie lesson. That is: that Christian Princes may be present & intermedle with Bishops in counsels, in causes of Religion, and that therefore Pope Liberius here speaketh of Emperours, Leaueleanantes, and Judges, that be Hæretiques, intruders, threatners, and violent forcers, not to be present, and of none other.

Liberius fa. 451  
Tom. 1. Athan.  
Non enim fieri  
potest vt locum  
in Synodo ha-  
beant qui fide  
impij sunt. &c.  
Non comes se  
iugerat nec Iu-  
dex minetur.

Dorman. Fol. 25.

Thus was the Emperour answered by that great good old man, Out of Hosius  
and true confessor Hosius the Bishop of Corduba in spayne, to whom  
as Theodoretus writeth Athanasius was wont to saie that no man  
came sicke and wounded, that went not a way hole and cured.

lib. 1. fol. 36. b. &  
2. 43. b.

DD 3

NaWell

Norwell.

It is very true that *M. Dozman* saith: this *Hosius Cardubensis* was a great, good, old man, and a true confessour, of whom *Athanasius*, not onely by the testimony of *Theodozetus*, in his historie by you noted, but in his owne woꝝkes also doth geue moꝝe cōmendation to him, than you haue here noted: and this amongst others. Non enim quicquam latere potest in viro illo (*Hosio*) tantæ claritudinis. In qua enim Synodo ille non dux & antesignanus fuit? quem non ille recta tuendo in sententiam suam pertraxit? Quæ ecclesia illius præfidentia non pulcherima monumenta retinet. &c. that is to say: foꝝ nothing can lie hidde in that man (*Hosius*) being of so great fame oꝝ renowne. Foꝝ in what Synode oꝝ councill was not he captaine, and chiefe stāderd bearer? Whom hath not he by defending and mainteining of the truth, drauen to his side: what Church doth not retaine most godly monumentes and tokens of his præfidence? Thus farre *Athanasius*, and muche moꝝe to his further praise. And I meruaile that *M. Dozman* was so spare in his cōmendation, and why he omitted these his true praises, that he was the captaine and president in Synodes and councelles? Did it greaue him that he could finde no sache praise foꝝ *Pope Liberius*: oꝝ feared he y it might seeme to sound shꝛendly against the supꝛemacie of the Church of Rome, if the Bishop of *Coꝝduba* and not of Rome, were the captaine and president in councels? It may be that *M. Dozman* will saye, he was a captaine and president, as deputie oꝝ legate of the Church of Rome, and not in his owne right, foꝝ so I haue heard. But I thinke *Hosius* himselfe neuer vnderstoode that. Will you heare his owne woꝝdes

*Athanasii* Apol.  
de fuga, sub Sy-  
riano duce pag.  
322, 323.

Dux & ante sig-  
nanus.

In sua sententiã.

woordes w<sup>o</sup>rttē w<sup>i</sup>th<sup>i</sup>n foure lynes after the place here  
 by M. Dozman alleaged, where he speaketh of Athana-  
 sius: whome the Emperour would haue had him by his  
 subscription to accuse, there he saith thus. Neque A-  
 thanasij accusationibus subscribo, quem nos & Ro-  
 mana Ecclesia, & vniuersa synodus innocentem pro-  
 nunciavit, that is to saie: neither will I subscribe (saith  
 Hosius) to Athanasius accusations, whome we, and  
 the Church of Rome, the vniuersall Synode, haue pro-  
 nounced innocent. Thus farre Hosius Cordubensis,  
 shewing by the ordze of these woordes, that he thought,  
 euen as Athanasius reporteth of him: that he was the  
 captaine and president of the councill in deede. Which  
 woordes Hosius Warmiensis did wel here to leaue out,  
 lest it might be knowen, that holy Hosius Cordubensis  
 had no knowledge of that Supremacie of the Church  
 of Rome, which is now defended by Hosius Warmiensis: Lib. 1. fo. 36. b. &  
2. fol. 43. b.  
 els had he had knowledge thereof, was he not very pre-  
 sumptuous, or partial to him selfe, to keape such ordze:  
 Nos & Romana ecclesia, we & the Roman Church.  
 And was not Athanasius also partfall with him, who In Apologia de  
fuga sub Syriano  
 heapeth the same ordze, sayng: Nec magno Hosio  
 confessori, neque Episcopo Romano, neque tot Hi-  
 spanis, Gallis, Aegyptijs, Africanis Episcopis peperce-  
 runt, that is: neither spared they, great Hosius the con-  
 fessor, neither the Bishop of Rome, neither so many,  
 Spanish, French, Egyptian, and African Bishoppes.  
 Is this so cōstant preferring of Hosius, befoze y<sup>e</sup> Bishop,  
 and Church of Rome, to no purpose, specially seyng  
 M. Dozman doth of suche ordze ble to gather a superio-  
 ritle of those, who be first in ordze: But if M. Dozman Dor. sup. fo. 197  
& 20.  
 will in these places haue y<sup>e</sup> greatest (as in procession of  
 the

the Clergie) so go behinde, thā doth Hosius biskopes, and after the Romayne Charche, makinge mention of the generall Synode or councell, giue a suspition that it shoulde be of greater authoritie than the Church of Rome, whiche may by no meanes be abidden: and by the same reason, the Egyptian and Africane Bishops shoulde be greater than the Romaine Bishoppes, for that they are placed by Athanasius in the laste places.

Sup. fol. 19. & 20

Whiche I haue the rather noted, for that M. Dozman is suche a narrowe obseruer of the order of reheralles, both in the Doctors and Scripturs also. But howsoeuer the order be, very truthe it is, that this Hosius was as saith Athanasius, and as his name soundeth, an holy man, but yet a mā, which he, as wel as Pope Liberius befoze alleaged, did shoue. In which respect M. Dozman shuld haue done better, to haue alleaged these sayings in Athanasius name, in whose epistle (here by M. Dozman noted) they are writtē, thā in Pope Liberius, & Hosius his names. For popes testimonies, as vsually struing against pꝛinces, are to be suspected in this case, & Pope Liberius (though by the extreame inforcement of Constantius I grant) did subscribe to the Arian Heresie: and Hosius did communicate with Ursatius and Valēs, Ariane Heretikes, as Athanasius in this same

Epist. ad solita  
sua vitā agētes.

Epistle by M. Dozman here alleaged, doth testifie: the authoritie therofore of Pope Liberius, and Hosius Cordubensis, as men yieldinge to the Emperour in suche matters of Religion, are not so good in this case, as is Athanasius his authoritie: though M. Dozman, as do they that numbꝛe, rather than iudge, do delight to make a muster of a multitude of testimonies. And it is to be noted, that Hosius Warmiensis the Cardinall,

vous

your onely authour in this treatte **D.** Dozman, beinge nothing moued with that great blotte of **Hosius** **Cozdubensis**, cōmunicating with **Hæretikes**, nor with the communiō of the name **Hosius**, commen to them to w, to purge the said **Hosius** of the said cryme: he vnderstāding yet, what a daungerous thing it was to the holy church of **Rome**, that **Liberius** **Pope** of **Rome** (who can not you know, erre) shuld subscribe to the **Ariā** **hæresie**: there the man like a good **Cardinall** of **Rome**, sicketh not to say, that **Athanasius** who testifieth, that **Pope** **Liberius** did so subscribe to the **Arian** **Hæresie**, knewe not the truth of the matter, but beleaued vncerten and false reportes, and rumozs. Of **S. Hierome** also, who likewise testifieth of **Liberius**, that he subscribed to the **Arian** **hæresie**, **Hosius** saith the same, that **S. Hierome** as a mā liuing in wildernes, knew not the truth. Wel, they towe, the one so worthy a **Bishop**, the other a moze worthy **Prestre**, both very godly, both excellently learned, the one liuing in the same time, that **Pope** **Liberius** did, and exercised in the same cōtrouersies against the **Arians**, with him, the other liuing shortly after his time, and being a **Prest** of **Rome**: these towe, and such towe, knewe not the truth of **Liberius** **Pope** of **Rome**: but one **Hosius** **Uarmiensis** liuing nowe, a **Cardinall** of **Rome** that nowe is, knoweth the truth of that, which was done. **xij.** hundred yeres befoze he was bozne. But nowe let vs see what **Hosius** **Cozdubensis** that good ould man saith.

Hof. li. 2. f. 84. b.

*Dorman. Fol. 25.*

*This notable and auncient father, this true confessor of Christes* Translated word  
*saith (for so did also Athanasius call him) when he sawe that the* forwoorde, ouz

**C e**

**Emperour**

of Hofius. lib. 7. Emperour Constantius would needes take vpon him the gouernement  
 fol. 35. b. Hofi<sup>o</sup> of the church which belonged not to him: first he proposed to him  
 Cordubēsis pro- the example of his brother Constans, who liuing like a vertuous Prince  
 posito fratris ex- within his boundes neuer attempted the like, and after he writeth thus.  
 emplo, quid tale Ne te misceas ecclesiasticis, neque nobis in hoc genere prae- Athanas.  
 inquit a Costāte cipe, sed potius a nobis ea discē. Tibi deus imperium com- epist. ad  
 factum est? &c. misit, nobis quae sunt ecclesiae concredidit. Et quemadmodū litiā vi  
 qui tuum imperium malignis oculis capit, contradicit ordi- agentes.  
 nationi diuinā: ita & tu caue ne quae sunt ecclesiae ad te re-  
 trahens, magno crimini fias obnoxius. Date (scriptum est)  
 quae sunt Caesaris Caesari, & quae Dei deo: that is to saie. En-  
 tremedle not your selfe (O Emperour) in ecclesiasticall causes, nor take  
 not vpon you to commaunde vs in those matters, but the things that  
 belong thereto learne you them rather of vs: To you hath God com-  
 mitted th' empire, and to vs the busines and affaires of the Church.  
 And euen as he that will with comptrolling vie checke your gouer- A necessi-  
 nement resisteth the ordinance of God: so take you also good hede, admoni  
 lest in drawing to you those things which appertine to the church for Prin  
 you incurre a great and a heynouse faulte, Gine (it is written) to that cot-  
 Caesar that whiche is his durie, and to God that whiche is Gods. meddle i  
 matters  
 the chur

Nowell:

Why do not you tell M. Dozman, what manner of  
 gouernement of the Church it was, that Constantius  
 would needes take vpon him: why make you no men-  
 tion of the violence by him, and his courtiers vsed in  
 Christs Church, by Hofius your authoz, and not only  
 in Athanasius, plainly expressed: Why tell you not a-  
 gaine what it was, that Constans the Emperour, Co-  
 stantius his brother, neuer attempted, but do say that  
 Constans neuer attempted the like: You might haue  
 bene bound with your authour Hofius to haue tolde,  
 that neither Constans the Emperour nor his courtiers  
 vsed

Hof. li. 1. f. 36.  
 Hofi<sup>o</sup> Cordubē-  
 sis. Omitte tu  
 violētiā tuā. &c.

Deo. l. 1. c. 1.  
 Deo. l. 1. c. 1.

used any such force against Bishoppes, as did Constantius. But you would not open the truth, lest it should appeare, that our Princes herein are like to Constantius, not, as you would have it seeme, to Constantius: who neither by them selves, nor their courtiers, have used any force: and that your Pope by all cruelty, inforcing all men to his poppish Heresie, is moste lyke to cruell Constantius, moste unlike to that mylde Prince Constantius. And we doe graunt, that Hosius Cordubensis, did like an holy Bishoppe warne Constantius, beinge a wicked and violent Prince, or Tyrant rather, and an Haretique also, that he should not intermeddle with Church matters, or persons, and that he beinge both vnlearned, and infected with errour, should not take vpon hym to teache learned and godly Bishoppes, but should rather learne of them. And it is very true, that all Princes learned and vnlearned, godly and vngodly, should learne of the Bishoppes, rather than teache them: and so learned and godly should the Bishoppes be, that learned Lay men (not onely vnlearned) might be gladde to learne of them. But will M. Doorman gather hereof, that men must learne of vnlearned Bishoppes, who can not teache: or of vngodly Bishoppes though learned, who will not teache the truth? Would M. Doorman that Constantius shuld haue learned of Eusebius the Artian Bishop, or other Artian Bishops: If he wold, sure I am, y neither Hosius Cordubensis, nor Liberius, nor Athanasius wold so. And yet they, though wicked Bishoppes, were called and counted Bishops. It is certen thererfore, y suche sentences as is this of Hosius Cordubensis: *Do not O Emperour: intermeddle with Church matters and persons,* hath his qualification,

Illi maiore vim  
sub tuo nos ex-  
citant. &c.

both of the Emperour, and of the Church, persons of  
 Bishops. For, be the Emperour godly, (as for example  
 was Valentinian the elder) than do all the godly Bi-  
 shops of Hellespontus & Bithinia say (not, as doth here  
 Hosius to Constantius, intermedle not in Church ma-  
 tters, nor with Church persons but) we praye you vouchsafe  
 to be present with vs, to entreate of certen poinctes in Religion to be  
 reformed. If the Emperour be godly, as was Constan-

Agust. epist. 166.

tinus, than do the godly Bishops Cæcilianus & Felix  
 not say, (as doth here Hosius) medle not with Ecclesia-  
 sticall personnes, neither do they refuse the iudgement  
 of suche delegates, as were by the Emperour ap-  
 pointed: neither the iudgement of the Emperour him-  
 selfe, who in deede finally determined Bishop Cæcilia-  
 nus his cause. The residue of Hosius wordes against  
 Constantius are spoken, because that he took vpon him,

Principes Episco-  
 porum.

Dor. post. f. 26. a

as Prince of Bishoppes, or as Bishop of all Bishops,  
 as Athanasius testifieth, and as Hosius, and with him  
 Dor. man also hereafter doth acknowledge. Whiche  
 thinge seing our Princes neuer did (nor no man at this  
 day doth y like, but the Pope.) Hosius sayngs against  
 suche Princes, as do take vpon the Bishops offices, ca-  
 not appertain to our Princes, who are so farre of from  
 claiming to be Bishops of Bishops, (as did Constantius)

In the admoni-  
 tion to the sim-  
 ple, deceived by  
 the malicious.

that they will not take vpon them any worse Priestes  
 office, nor any part therof: as they do also publikely te-  
 stifie to y world. Now as Hosius Dor. Dor. mas autho-  
 doth for a batage intermit & leue out wordes, & sentences  
 in the middle of places, out of the ancient authours by him  
 allaged, as he did in the last place befoze of Pope Libe-  
 rtus, so doth he euer cut of, and make an end of his alle-  
 gation, whā any thing soloweth, y maketh against him.

For

For it foloweth immediately after these wordes alleaged here out of Hosius Cordubensis, by Hosius Garmienſis, and out of him, by M. Dorman, after this ſort. *Date, ſcriptum eſt, quæ ſunt Caſaris Caſari: & quæ Dei Deo. Neq; igitur ſas eſt nobis in terris Imperiũ tenere; neq; tu thymiamatũ, & ſacrorum poteſtatẽ habes Imperator. &c.* That is to ſay: It is writẽ, giue to Caſar that whiche is his dueſtie, and to God, that whiche is Goddes. For neither is it lawfull for vs (Biſhoppes) to hould Empire or dominion in the earth: neither thou O Emperour, haſt power of offering incenſe, and of Goddes holy Sacramentes, or thinges. Theſe be Hosius Cordubensis wordes, who like a true man, as the text of our Sauour was of tow partes, of Caſars dueſtie, and Goddes: ſo maketh he declaration of them both: that neither Biſhops being miniſters, nor lordes of Goddes Church, may medle with worldly dominions, nor Emperours and Princes with Biſhoppes offices. But you that are ſo affraid leaſt Princes ſhould medle with Biſhoppes offices, do mainteine, that your high Biſhoppe may inuade Princes dominions. Now had the offices of Biſhoppes, that Princes may not medle with, *potestas thymiamatum & ſacrorũ, the power of offering incenſe, and of the ſacramentes, or holy thinges,* beẽ by Hosius Garmienſis added, as they were in Hosius Cordubensis expreſſed, al the worlde might haue ſene, that our Princes did intermedle in no ſuch matiers: & that therefore theſe places were in vayne alleaged againſt them. But Hosius Garmienſis, wilier than Hosius Cordubensis, when he had ſaide for Priettes againſt Princes, let alone that, which was for Princes againſt Priettes, and whiche touched his Popes, and popiſhe

Imperium.

Sacrorum.

Sext. Decretal.  
li. 3. Tit. 16. cap.  
Periculoſo in  
gloſa. Papa toti<sup>o</sup>  
orbis obtinet  
principatum.

Helates worldly dominions, and principdomes so néere  
 the quicke: who, without all cause quarrellinge with  
 Princes, as vsinge a point of Antichrist, by inuadinge  
 of Priestes offices, wilbe sure of a point of Antichrist,  
 by inuadinge of worldly dominions, by Christ him selfe,  
 S. Peter, and holy Hosius Cordubensis, here to them  
 forbidden. Should we vse such manglinge, mayminge,  
 minlinge, & curtallinge of the auuncient Fathers autho-  
 ritie, such dissemblinge of their full-sentence, and true  
 meaning, as doth Hosius Warmienensis here in Hosius  
 Cordubensis, and elles every where, thei would fill the  
 ayre it selfe with outcries against vs. Thou wilt mer-  
 uaile good Reader peradventure, that I doe blame Ho-  
 sius onely, and not M. Dozman, with whome I haue to  
 doe: surely in this treatie I haue almost nothinge to doe  
 but with Hosius: with M. Dozman very litle, who is  
 blamelesse here, seeinge he did write as much, as was in  
 his authour. For though Hosius Cordubensis haue  
 moze than M. Dozman, yet hath Hosius Warmienensis  
 no moze in this place, thā he: though other where he doe  
 gene him selfe this libertie, to leaue out also, of his Ho-  
 sius Warmienensis wordes, or sentences, that he thinketh  
 to sounde against him. But yet here is one foule faulte  
 in M. Dozman. For, where he hath but one onely sen-  
 tence of Hosius Cordubensis, that ould holy Father, &  
 that, as all other, borrowed of Hosius Warmienensis, yet  
 hath he like a kinde man, in the margent acknowledged  
 the authour, though so longe agoe dead, yea and that  
 with his notable commendation: but hauinge this, and  
 all other places, yea and all this whole treatie out of  
 Hosius Warmienensis, this day liuinge, taken by whole  
 handfulls, yet doth he not as much, as once marke in  
 his

his margent any remembraunce of him, as his authour, that I can finde: not so gratfull towarde old Hosius Cozdubensis, as vngratfull to Hosius Tarmienis: neither so mindeful of me dead, time out of minde since, as mindelesse and forgetful of men, and so notable man, Cardinall of Rome yet liuinge, to whome he is so muche bounden, and so deepeley indebted, for so many summes of sentences, and authozities.

Dorman. Fol. 25.

Translated out  
of Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. 120.

Athanasius speakinge to this purpose saith, Si istud est iudicium episcoporum, &c. If this iudgement belonge to Bishoppes, what hath the Emperour to doo therewith? or if on the contrary parte these matters be wrought by the threatenings of Cesar, what neede is there of any men beside to beare the bare title of Bishoppes? when from the beginning of the world hath it bene harde of, that the iudgement of the Church hath taken auctoritie of the Emperour? Or when hath this byn agnised for any iudgement? Many synodes haue there byn before his time, many counsels hath the Church holden, but the time is yet to come that euer either the Fathers went about to perswade the Prince any suche matter, or that the Prince shorwed himselfe to be curiouse in matters of the church. But now haue we a spectacle neuer scene before, brought in by Arius heresie.

Nowell.

Now an other leape foze ward againe into the same place (out of the which he lepte backe ward befoze) of Hosius Tarmienis (not Cozdubensis) second booke: which is a garden mooste plentious of flowers, for M. Dorman to garnish his garlande withall. It is moost true that Athanasius saith, y<sup>e</sup> matters of Religiō in controuersie should

Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. 120. Vbi prius  
erat.

Epistola ad solitariā vitā agentes, & Hosius lib. 2. fol. no. 2. Constantius facit quod sibi volupe est, &c. Sin ista minis Cæsaris constantur. &c.

should be tried by the iudgement of godly and learned Bishoppes, according to the worde of God, and not by the threathninge of violent Princes, accordinge to their owne pleasure: as Constantius would haue ordered the matier: for, so saith Athanasius, so saith M. Dozmanns authour Hosius, though M. Dozmann doe partly dissemblye the truth. But where the Bishoppes be either vnllearned or wicked, as haue of longe your Popes, & especiallye the Prelates beene, goodlie Christian Princes may not with threathninges, as did Constantius the Emperour, but by reasonable and peaceable meanes, assemblinge learned and godly men together, and not accordinge to their owne pleasure, (as did Cōstantius) but according to Goddes pleasure, declared in his worde, amende that is amisse: as godly Princes of all ages haue done.

To your question to be answered by the Huguenotes (for so is your pleasure now to terme vs, seinge the contumelies of English termes can not suffice your malice) we say. From the beginninge of the worlde till this day, we neuer hearde that the iudgement of the Church, should take authoritie of the Emperour, nor of any other worldly creature, but onely of the truth, of Goddes eternall worde, els is it no iudgement: though you doe to your Romishe Antichriste blasphemously attribute this prerogatiue, y<sup>e</sup> the iudgement of the Church should take authoritie of him. And thus much we say to your meruelous question, as you take it to be.

To the residue of Athanasius wordes we say: that in all the Synodes or councelles that haue beene, neuer did any godly Fathers goe aboute to perswade any Prince any suche matier, that the iudgement of the Church should take authoritie of him, neither did any  
godly

godly Princes ever take upon him any such matter: neither showed him selfe curious in Church matters, but with reuerence, and good aduise of the godly and learned, specially of the Cleargie, hath seene such things as were amisse, reformed accoꝛdinge to Gods holy woꝛde. To conclude: you doe see no spectacle of Arrius heresie in our Church: & therefore is your note false & malicious, bearing the people in hande, that Arrius heresie (which brought into the Church the orderinge of all things after wicked Princes lustes) should haue brought into our Churches the reformatio of Religion, & abandoning of your popishe abuses and hæresies, accomplished according to Goddes will, in his holy woꝛde declared, by the care, diligence, and auctoritie of our Christian Princes: after the examples of all godly Princes of all ages before them.

*Dorman. Folio. 25.*

And to wardes the ende of the same Epistle, of Constantius attemptinge to meddle in causes ecclesiasticall he writeth thus. Quid igitur hic quod Antichristi est omisit? aut quid ille ubi uenit fit plus committere poterit? aut quomodo ille in aduentu suo non repererit sibi expeditam uiam ad dolos ab isto præparatam? Si quidem iam denuo in locū ecclesiasticæ cognitionis, palatium suum tribunal earum causarum constituit, sesequē earum litium summū principem & auctorem facit. VVhat is therefore saith he, to be done by Antichrist: that Constantius hath omitted: or what can Antichrist doo more at his comminge then he hath done already? Or how can it be that he shall not finde the way ready made by him when he commeth for all his discreetfull Wyles. For euen now againe in the place of the ecclesiasticall iurisdiction; he hath placed and appointed his owne palace, to be the consistory of those causes that should haue bene determined there by, and he maketh him selfe the chiefe iudge and arbitre thereof.

ff

And

Translated out  
of Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. 120. b.

And a little after he addeth: Quis enim videns eum in decer-  
nēdo principem se facere episcoporum, & præsidere iudicijs  
ecclesiasticis: non merito eam ipsam abominationem deso-  
lationis dicat esse que à Daniele prædicta est: for who seeinge Daniel  
him in iudgement make him selfe the chiefe of the Bishoppes, and  
rule in causes ecclesiasticall, may not woorthely say that he is that  
abomination of desolation that Daniel prophced of.

Nowell.

It is most true that Constantius that wicked Em-  
perour resembled Antichrist in very many pointes:  
whereof you do dissemble the most parte, to make the  
simple to beleue our godly Princes to be like to Con-  
stantius in conditions, and so with him to be guiltie of  
Antichristianisme. And you do wickedly, and sclaunde-  
rously applie the ould Fathers sayings spoken against  
Constantius, hauing so many pointes of Antichrist, to  
our Princes, hauing no one pointe of Antichrist at all,  
nor of Constantius neither. For y<sup>e</sup> moze plaine declara-  
tion whereof, I wil first note y<sup>e</sup> pointes of Antichrist by  
you partly out of Hosius (as by him moze fully some-  
where out of Athanasius) gathered: & afterwarde I will  
soyne to the some other pointes, plainely in y<sup>e</sup> same E-  
pistle by you alleaged, by Athanasius him selfe declared  
to haue bene in Constantius: for y<sup>e</sup> which pointes, as wel y<sup>e</sup>  
said Athanasius, as Liberius, Hosius, Hilarus, & other  
godly auncient fathers laide Antichristianisme to his  
chardge. All whiche pointes lacking in our godly Chri-  
stian Princes, shall discharge the of Antichristianisme,  
wherewith you do most maliciously attempt to blotte the.

First he vnto to call Bishops into his Palace, as into  
a place of Ecclesiasticall Synode, or councill, or to the  
place of iudgement, in causes of Religion.

And

2. And there he used threathninges and force, by him  
 selfe, or his officers, against godly & learned Bishoppes:  
 thereby to make them to agree to his luste or pleasure  
 in causes of Religion: and as Athanasius saith, he at-  
 tempted this, not by reasoninge, concellinge, perswa-  
 dinge, but by swordes, and dartes, by violence, whip-  
 pinge, beatinge, and killinge: whiche to do, are the offi-  
 ces of Pilate and Caiphas, as to suffre, is the proprietie  
 of Christians: saith Athanasius.

3. Thirdly he toke vpon him, to be Prince of Bishops,  
 or head Bishoppe of Bishoppes: so that all Bishoppes  
 must of necessitie yelde to his minde, and will. And  
 thus farre may appeare, by the Antichristian poinces  
 by M. Dorman noted, to haue bene in Constantius,  
 though to obscure the matter, he withdraueth here and  
 there some wordes and sentences in Athanasius, and  
 Bossus his authour, at his pleasure. Now besides these  
 poinces, there were in the saide Constantius other  
 poinces of Antichristianisme by Athanasius in his said  
 Epistle plainly declared: whereof I will note parte.

4. He would without triall, credite euery false reporte  
 made by naughtie men vpon godly and learned Bishops,  
 and thereupon, without all proufe made, or accuser  
 known, by and by cast them into exile.

Tamest nullū habeat accusatorem, modo ipsi crimen fingant, statim  
 ripitur, & sententia Imperatoris ē vestigio in exilium mittitur.

5. In admittinge others into the rowmes of such god-  
 ly and learned Bishops expelled, the examination was  
 not had accordinge to this rule of S. Paule: It behoueth  
 that a Bishoppe be blamelesse, but it was onely said to them  
 be against Christ, and be not carefull for thie manners,  
 for that onely will suffice thee to thy commendation,

piscepum esse and favour with the Prince, irreprehensibilem: sed hoc illi dicitur, sentias contra Christum, nec de moribus tuis sis auxiliatus: id enim tibi sufficit ad commendationem, & ad principis amicitiam.

6. Athanas. Apol. ad Constantium. fa. 316. Si quis plus pecunie offerret nomine honorabatur, neque apud illos villo in discrimine erat, sine Ethnicus esset, sine non, modo aurum daret.

If any did offre a rounde summe of money, he was by Constantius his officers by and by made a Bishop: no regarde was had, were he an Heathen, or no, so he gave them goulde.

7. Many of his chamberlaines, eunuches, or gelded me, fa. 438. & 452. & 459. beinge most wicked, and abhominable, made he chiefe iudges in causes Ecclesiasticall, and sondrie of them he made Bishoppes also.

8. They, and other as wicked men as they, were with great pompe, and company of Souldiars, brought into Fa. 441. Sed ex palatio cum militari manu & magnifica pompa, missus fuit: non aliter, quam si secularis magistratus ei demandatus esset & 450. item.

Bishoppiques, as it had bene into seculer offices.

9. To such as durst alleage Scripture, or reason, or any Canon Ecclesiasticall for them, he would answer: fa. 450. At ego volo, ut non sit &c. but my will shalbe in steade of the Canon, either obey Aut igitur obtemperate aut vos quoque exules estote.

therefoze, or be banished.

10. Ibidem. fa. 450. Qui contra dicit, aut exilium aut morte reportat.

If any Bishoppe, or other man, were he neuer so learned, or godly, durst speake against these thinges, he was sure for his rewarde to haue either banishment, or death.

11. The Heathen neuer used suche crueltie as did Constantius his Courtears, bearing the name of Christian men. They invaded Churches; when the Bishop and people were at prayer, and thus many, & would not suffer the bodics of the same to be buried, without money were geuen them theresoze.

12. Holy virgins, who serued Christ in true chastitie, they hailed by the heare, and bzinging them to the fier, and threating to burne them, whan they could not so bzing them to their hærtesie, they stripped them naked in the open streate, whipped them so, both vpon their naked bodie, and faces, that their friendes coulde not knowe them: and whan they in these tormentes cried vpon Christe, the Tyrantes would shoute, grenne vpon them, blasphemie, and increase their crueltie, not ceasing, vntil they, by most horrible tormentes had slayne many of them, not absteyning afterwarde from vilanie to their dead bodie.

Athan: sius Apo.  
de fuga sua. fa. 323  
Et ad solita. vii.  
agētes. fa. 468.

13. And, whiche was yet worse, if worse may be: Constantius made all this adw, all this persecution, & cruell warre, for impietie, against godlines: vpon Andie and zeale for the Ariane hærtesie, against the true faith: making a way for Antichrist, as his forriner, against our Saviour Christ. So, that no Church could be suffered freely to worship Christ: so, that the Christians mourning, said: Is Constantius become an Hæretique? The Heathen reloying on the other side, and praising their Idolles, said: Constantius is become an Heathen: and the Arians allowe our Religion.

Ibidē fa. 457. Bel-  
lū p impietate  
aduerſ pietatē,  
studiū zelusq; p  
Ariana hærēsi,  
preludique An-  
tichristi, cui viā  
Constanti⁹ mu-  
niuit. &c.

These, these, so many, and many mo, so many here to be witten, so wicked, so cruell, so horrible, so befoze unheard abominations, perpetrated by Constantius, that wicked Emperour, and his moze wicked Courtears and officers, and specially by his impure chamberlaines and geldinges; moued that fræ man Libertius, holy Hosius, and Athanasius, of immoytall fame, to wripte of him as they did: moued them to forbiddē suche an Emperour, suche Leaueteantes, suche Judges,

Ibidem fa.  
460. Omni-  
bus non sine ad-  
miracione inters-  
rogantibus, num  
Constantius Hæ-  
retic⁹ fact⁹ esset?  
Ibidem fa. 461.  
Ethnici igit̄ lēo-  
la sua laudib⁹ fe-  
rebāt, dicebātq;.  
Cōstanti⁹ Ethni-  
cus factus est, &c.  
Ariani nostra  
agnoscunt. &c.

Suche Eunuches, the Intermedling in matters of Religion, with suche thzeatninges, suche violence, such crueltie, suche wickednes, suche falshood as they bled: moued them to tell him, that suche a palace, with suche companie replentished was no meet place for Ecclesiasticall councelles, noz a Judgement seate meete for matters of Religion: moued them to tell him, that he did wickedly take vpon him to be Prince, or head Bishop ouer all Bishoppes: moued them to tell him, that he omitteth nothing belonging to Antichrist, that he made a ready way for Antichrist, as his very forrūner. These sentences spoken by those ancient fathers against Constantius, and his officers, suche men, or rather cruell beastes, for suche causes, suche byberies, suche thzeatninges, suche violences, suche cruelties, such inuasiōs, of true Christians, and godly Bishoppes, being at their praier, and seruice of God in the Church, suche murdering of holy men, suche halling, suche naking, suche scourging, suche tearing in peeces of shamefast, tendze, and pure Virgins: and al this, for the zeale, and maintenance of such horrible Arian heresies, euen against our Sautour Iesus Christ his diuinitie. The sentences I say, written by Liberius, Hosius, Athanasius, against such, and for suche causes, it seemed good to P. Doorman to applie to our gracious Soueraigne, knowen to the world, to be as farre from al Arian, and other heresies, as she is farre from suche wronges, force, and crueltie: farre from suche horrible tormentinge of Virgins, so shewing her loue to virginittie, as is to other Quēnes vncustomed: so farre from sheading of innocent blood, that she neuer yet shed drop of blood of her most deadly enemies. Whose loue, and maintenance of true Religion notwithstanding, whose abstinēce from  
 all

all wrongs, threathninges, and violences, whose clemencie about all Princes, of al times, whose vertues moſte contrarie to Conſtantius his vices, could not ſtay M. Doorman from blottinge of his booke, wriſten againſt her moſt lauful, and godly governaunce, with ſuch ſentences, ſuche pointes, ſuch notes of intruſions, threathninges, violences, hæreſies, Antichriſtianismes, as her grace is moſt farre from, and are therefore moſte vnmeet for her grace to heare: meete for no man, but M. Doorman, to wriſte.

But for ſo muche as M. Doorman here is buſie with pointes of Antichriſtianisme, and Conſtantius is by M. Doorman noted, and by Athanaſius plainly declared, to be the ſozriner, and way maker for Antichriſt, ſeing ſhortly after this Conſtantius, the power of that Romiſhe Antichriſt the Pope, began to ſprunge and riſe. Let vs ſee, whether, as I haue declared the pointes of Antichriſtianisme, whiche were in Conſtantius, to be falſly aplied to our Chriſtian Princes: ſo I can proue them moſte trucly to be in their Antichriſtian Pope of Rome. And firſt, to the firſt point of Antichriſt.

1. The Pope of Rome, being in dæde none other, but a worldly Tyrant, doth make his Romiſhe Court, the iudgement ſeate of all controuerſies in Religion, and there determineth them at his pleaſure. And in counceils likewiſe, things are done and determined after his will and luſt, and not according to the will of God, declared in the Scriptures: and ſo in this pointe of Antichriſt, by Liberius, Hoſius, and Athanaſius, declared, he agreeth with Conſtantius.

2. Touching the ſecond, he uſeth threathnynges, force, and violence, by inforcement, beating, and whippinge, not by

not by reasoning, counselling, perswadinge, to bringe all men to his obedience, and popishe hærésie, euen as did Constantius. And where as Athanasius saith to be beaten, is the proprietie of Christians, to whippe and persecute Christians, to be the offices of Pilate, & Caiphas, what would he iudge of our Pope and his Prelates, were he now liuing?

Athana. ad solit.  
viam agentes.  
fa. 454.

Hof. li. 1. fa. 35. a

3. Thirdly, the Pope being no Bishop at all, neither hauing any signe, nor token at all of a Bishop, by the Scriptures appoinced, and hauing all signes and tokens of a temporall Tyrant, taketh vppon him as did Constantius, to be Prince of all Bishops, or head Bishop ouer all Bishops: and the same do our Papistes mainteine, and defende.
4. Fourthly, false rumours and reposes made of godly men, are by him, and his Prelates credited, wherepon, he, his Prelates, and inquisidours do proceede ex officio, and otherwise, and condemne innocent men without lafull p̄duse, or knowing of any accuser: eue as did Constantius.
5. Fifthly, learning, and innocentie of life (accozdinge to S. Pauls rule) are not so muche required in him, that shalbe made a popishe Prelate, or the Pope him selfe: but his haitred of Christ, and true Christians, is a speciall commendation to the attaininge of all popishe Prelacie, euen as it was in Constantius his time.
6. Sixthly, so one haue money enough to offer to the Popes holines, be he neuer so vnlearned an asse, be he of neuer so beastly a life, he is admitted to the greatest popishe Prelacies. And so commenly, Princes, or noble mēs second sonnes, courtiers, rusters, and Soulers, so they haue money to geue, become popishe Bishops,  
Cardi

Cardinals. For as frer Mantuane one that wel knew the custome of the Court of Rome, saith, Venalia nobis, Tempia, Sacerdotes, altaria, sacra, coronæ, ignes, thura, preces, cœlum est venale, Deusq; Churches, Priests, altars, holie thinges, and crownes, fires, incense, prayers, heaue, & God him selfe are set a sale with vs at Rome: for of that place he expressly speaketh.

7. The Popes chamberleines (euen suche as were Constantius chamberleines, I need to say no moze) are preferred to Bishoprikes befoze godly or learned men.

Andreas Alciatus euen in our daies, when men might thinke they would be moze circumspect, cōplaceth, and sumeth at Pope Paulus the thirde, for preferring to the Bishoprike of Come, a vile vnlearned man, taken from the secret filthe of the Popes chamber, befoze Paulus Iouius, being so notably learned, and eloquent a man. And it is knowen and abhorred not abroad onely, but in Rome it selfe, that Pope Julius the thirde, whose beastly life neither these times could stay, nor popishe wryters could couer, created infamous persones Cardinales of Rome, and amongst others, one mosse abominable, not onely in all honest places, but euen in the very court of Rome it selfe.

8. Diuers popishe Prelates, and specially the Popes them selues, are with great pompe, and companies of souldiours, and armed gardes, brought into their prelacies, and papacies, as it were into seculer offices: eue as it was in Constantius his time vled. to place the Arian Bishoppes.

9. If any alleage Scripture, reason, or ould Canon, against these thinges, the Pope and his Papistes saye, that the Scripture is the sense, that the Pope gathereth

Of thereof

Andr. Alciat.  
epist. præfixa hi-  
storix Pauli Io-  
uij. Quendam,  
qui ex arcanis  
cubiculi sordib<sup>9</sup>  
in lucem repêre  
sit pducus. &c.  
In vita Iulij. 3.  
addita ad finem  
Platina.

thereof, his wil is in steede of reason, his pleasure declared in his rescriptes, is the Canon of the Church: euen as said Constantius that his will and lust should stand for the Canons.

10.

If any dare gaine saie these thinges, banishment, or death (euen as it was in Constantius time) is his rewarde. And as in Constantius time not counselles, reasons, persuations, but swordes, whippes, exiles, imprisonmentes, and deathes were vsed, as testificth Athanasius: so now in these cruell daies, vppon a question or twaine, touching the Popes Supremacie, or their Transubstantiation moued, and answered not to their mynd receiued, in steede of reasons, counselles, persuations: threathnings, prisons, stocks, chaines, whippes, tormentes, faggottes, fire, and most cruell deathes, are now the popishe persuations, as they were y Arians.

H. 12.

Athana. ad solit.  
vitā agēt. f. 468.

Neither was this crueltie and murder vsed vppō all sortes, sexes, & ages, in Constantius his time moze, thā it is now vsed by the Pope & popishe Brelates, vppon all sortes of men and wemen, vppon striplinges & yong maidens, whome they do not onely bringe to the fire, threathning to burne them, as did the Arians in Constantius his time, but in dāde do most cruelly rost them quicke, and burne them to ashes.

13.

And as all that adoe was made in Constantius his time, to bringe all men to the Arian heresie: so is all this cruell busines made now by the Pope and his Brelates, to bring all men to their popishe heresie, and Antichristianitie.

To conclude therefore, seing Liberius, Hosius, and specially Athanasius, iudged Constantius to be the forerunner and way maker to Antichrist, in these pointes:

scing

seeing the papacie beginning to gather strength shortly after Constantius his time, and nowe grown to this greatnes, hath all those pointes of Antichristianisme, by Athanasius in that long treatie described, & a great many moe: who can doubt, but that papacie is Antichristianisme, and the Pope Antichrist: Whiche to coner, *M. Dorman*, and other like Popelings obiecte Antichristianitie to Christian Princes.

*Epist. ad solita.  
vitā agentes.*

*Dorman. Fol. 26.*

*Thus haue you hard good Readers, how thiese auuncient fathers Liberius, Hosius, and Athanasius, reprovod the doinges of Constantius the Emperour, the first (that we reade of and yet him selfe an Arrian and prouoked thereto by that wicked broode) that tooke vpō him to medle in ecclesiasticall iurisdiction.*

*Nowell.*

Thus you see good Readers the sayng of the auuncient fathers, Liberius, Hosius, and Athanasius written against Constantius, that wicked Emperour, cruel Tyrant, and Arrian heretike, the enemy of our Saviour Christe, the forerunner of Antichrist, to be by *M. Dormā* most vnworthely apted to our gracious Soueraigne, & most mercifull Prince, the enemy of the Arrian, and all other heresies, y<sup>e</sup> letter furth, & maintainer of Christes true Religion and Gospell. Where as in dede all the properties in Constantius, the forerunner of Antichrist, with manie moe, and moze horrible, are this day to be seene thoroughly accomplisshed, fulfilled, and perfected, in their Romish Pope, as the vndoubted Antichrist, thereby to be knowen to all, that haue eyes to see, and grace to vnderstande.

Dorman. Fol. 26.

Next after him succeeded in the Empire Iulian, of the historians Iulianus. graphers called apostata, for that that being once a professed Christian, he afterwarde renied his faith and became a wicked infidel. He Li. 6. hist. eccles. ca. robbed Churches, he plucked priests from the altars, and sent them to the warres. He did sacrifice and called him self as Sozomenus writeth of him by the name of Bishoppe: and finally by contempt termed the Christians Galilei, and was to them a more cruel scourge then any that went before him. Of him it is likely that Gregorius Nazianzenus who liued in his time would saie no lesse, then of Valens the Emperour plaieng not muche vnlike part he did. Vvhome in the midst of that ruffle whiche he made in the Church he told to his face, that his power was subiect to his consistory and him selfe a shepe of his stocke. Oration. subdit. ti more per culf. & in per. irasc team.

Norwell.

To this I answer. Our Prince is no Apostata, no renier of his faith, no infidel, no Church robber, no plucker of Priestes from Gods altars, or tables, no sacrificer, no vsurper of the name of a Bishop, no misnaming of Christians, no cruell scourge, but a moste mercifull defender of them. Wherefoze, what soeuer is likely, that Gregorius Nazianzenus would say of the Apostata Iulianus, it is vere likely, you doe meane to saie no good, noz truth, that doe bring in the example of suche an abominable Apostata, and his vsurpations, in your treatte against our moste Christian, and godlie soueraignes lawfull authoritie. Nazianzenes sayng to the Emperour Valens, our Christiana Princes doe wel like, and allowe: neither refusing to obey them pronouncing Gods woord, noz to leade of the pastures of thir wholesome doctrine. But yet are they not soe sheepe (thanks

(thanks be to God) as to take your popishe woulues  
 for true pastours, noz your poisoned doctrine, for hole-  
 some pastures.

Dorman Fol. 26.

I can not here passe ouer in silēce the answere (I wot not whe-  
 ther I may call it more pleasant, more wittie, or more godly) that  
 Theodoretus in his ecclesiasticall historie writeth to be made by one  
 4. c. 18. *Eulogius*, a man for his vertues amongst his neighbours highly este-  
 med (the historie calleth him *primarium inter suos*, the chiefe  
 of the place where he dwelled) to an officier of *Valens* the Empe-  
 rour touching this matter. This *Valens* fauoring the heresie of *Ari-  
 rius*, encroched so far vpon ecclesiasticall iurisdiction, that he fell to  
 the deprivinge of Bishoppes, and the placinge of other in their  
 roomes, besides many other sondry enormities, and outrages. It hap-  
 pened so, that cominge on a time to a certaine towne in *Mesopotamia*  
 called *Edeffa*, where this *Eulogius* was then governour, and  
 thincking to doo there as elles where he had (that was to place  
 there a chaplaine of his to be Bishop) he was by this good man and  
 certaine other withstand. The officier that had to doo vnder the Em-  
 perour, traauyled earnestly to get his consent, and amongst other per-  
 suasions that he vsed to induce him thereto, it chaunced him to caste  
 out these woordes. *Coniungere cum imperatore*, Be contented  
 man to ioyne with the Emperour. set your harte at reste he will  
 haue it so. *Tum ille* (saith the historie) *placide & festiue Num-  
 quid vnā cum imperio etiam ille pontificatū est consecutus?*  
 why, answered he coldely and pleasantly, was he made a Bishoppe  
 that he was crowned Emperour? as who would say, what although  
 he be Emperour, yet hath not he thereby gotten auctoritie to depose  
 Bishoppes and ordeine newe, whiche onely Bishoppes muste doo. So  
 strange a thinge seemed it then good readers in *Christies* Church:  
 whiche now we see so commonly done.

EG 3

Nowell.

If any Christian Prince doe take vpon him at this day, that he is a Bishop as well as a kunge, than may this answere of Eulogius, pleasantly & wittilie be vsed against him: but if there be none such, than is it vnpleasantlie & fondly bzought in here by M. Dozman. This is the stoyle in Theodoretus. Valens y<sup>e</sup> Emperour with out all right & lawe banished at his pleasure godly Bishops, who were also his faithfull subiectes, & placed in their roumes wicked Arrians. Emögst others he banished y<sup>e</sup> Bishop of Edessa named Barses, a very godly & learned Bishop, with whome all the Citie was ioynd in vnitie of godly doctrine. Thā he sent his captaine named Modestus, who eraated of y<sup>e</sup> Priestes & Deacons, that thet should consent & agrāe with the Emperour Valens in Religion: as though their Bishoppe being banished, y<sup>e</sup> Emperour (who, euen as did Constantius befoze him, toke vpon him to be head Bishop of all Bishoppes) had now become to them in stæde of their Bishop. Where vpon Eulogius one of the chiefe of the companie (& not gouernour of y<sup>e</sup> towne as M. Dozman deceiued vntruly repozteth) said, hath he than with y<sup>e</sup> Empire gotten our Bishoprique to; for immediatly after y<sup>e</sup> same Eulogius saith further, we haue already a Bishop, & we solow his doctrine. Wherefoze how pleasant, wittie, & godly so euer this saying of Eulogius was touching wicked Valens, beinge both an Arrian hæretique, & a most cruell tyzaunt, vsing his will for lawe, banishinge godly Bishops, his faithfull subiectes, & ordeining wicked Arrians in their places, playing the Prince or head Bishop ouer all Bishops (as did befoze him Constantius) who would also by all kinde of persequution haue compelled all the people

Theodoretus.  
Principes, pres-  
byteri, inq̄, &  
Diaconi impe-  
rant adduci, &c.  
Athanasius ad  
solitaria vitam  
agentes.

Illius nutus se-  
quimur.

people in Cœssa to forsake the truth, whiche they had learned of their godly Bishoppe Barles, and to consent to his hereticall doctrine, proponed to them in his name, as though he had bene their Bishoppe in Barles stæde: though I say Eulogius answere concerninge such a Prince, might be pleasaunt, wittie and godly: ycat is it vnpleasauntly, vnwittely, and wickedly applied by M. Dozman to our Christian Prince, no heretique, no tyzaunt, no taker vppon her of any Bishoply ductie, or office, but leauinge to the Bishoppes their preachinge, their bindinge, and losinge, or excommunicating and absoluinge, and their ministeringe of the holy Sacramentes: deposinge no godly Bishops of will and pleasure, as did Valens, but accordinge to Goddes, and mans lawes, deposinge, or rather sufferinge the law to depose popishe heretiques, swozne to their Soueraignes swozne enemye. And M. Dozman comminge in with his *as who woulde say* not onely vnpleasauntly, but moſte falsely beareth the simple in hande, that Christian Princes do commonly now depose godly Bishoppes, and ordeine nue: whercas the lawe, rather than the Prince as I haue saide, deposeth suche popishe Prelates, swozne, and conspired against their Prince, with a foraigne vsurper, & Prince ordening no nue Bishops in their rowmes, as M. Dozman lieth, but comendinge mæte men by the Cleargie to be ordeined, as godly Princes haue vſed to do: and as the Popes them selves suffered the Kinges of Englaunde to do, so longe as they woulde suffer the Popes to take of the saide Bishoppes for their popishe Duties, both great summes of money, and also a solens athe, that they should neuer be true to their Prince.

And

And thus you see, how *D. Dozman* coulde not (as he saith) passe ouer in silence this pleasaunt, wittie, and godly sayinge, vsed by *Eulogius* of *Valens* the wicked *Arrian* Emperour, vntill he had thereupon framed out a great sozte of vnfauerie, wicked, and most leud, loude lies, vpon godly *Christian* Princes. And he hath here vpon marked in the margent, for a pleasaunt, wittie, and godly answeare, that, which no moze toucheth our godly Princes authoritie in matiers, and ouer persons *Ecclesiasticall*, than our Prince is touched with desire to be a *Bishoppe*. But *D. Dozman* measureth euery bodies desire by his owne,

*Dorman. Fol. 27.*

Translated out  
of *Hosi<sup>o</sup>*, woord  
for woorde,  
*lib. 1. fol. 37.*

Longe after these Emperours starre vp *Leo* *Isaurus*, Emperour of *Constantinople* (he that made warre with images). Against him God raised vp also his *Azarias*, one to warne him of his duetie, and that was that notable learned man *Iohn* *Damasceus*. *Giue* (saith he) *Sermon* the *Apostle* *Paule* crieth, to euery one his due, honour, feare, pension, tribute, to eche one that which they ought to haue. The charge that *kinges* haue, is to see well to their common weales, the ordering of the *Churches* apperteineth to the *pastours* and *teachers*. This manner of inuadinge other memmes offices, I can terme it no better my brethern then *robberie* and *plaine violence*. And a little after he hath these woordes: *Tibi o rex in ijs qua pertinent ad praesentis vitae negocia &c.* As for those things o *king* which concerne onely this present life, in those we willingly obey the. In orderinge the state of the *Churche*, we haue *shepherdes* which haue spoken to vs the woorde of *God*, that is to saie taught it vs, and haue left vs rites and orders therefore. And in the same place he addeth. *Non recipio regem qui per tyrannidem sibi sacerdotium vsurpat.* I acknowledge him for no *king*, that vsurpeth by *tirany* the *priestles* office.

office. And last of all to knit vp the knot in plaine woordes he saith.  
 Non assentior vi regum legibus gubernetur ecclesia, sed pa-  
 trū potius traditionibus, siue scriptæ hæ sint siue nō scriptæ.  
 I consent not saith he that the Church of God shalbe gouerned by  
 the lawes of Kings, but by the traditions rather of oure fathers be  
 they written or vnwritten.

NoWell.

Here hath M. Dozman starte backwarde againe in-  
 to Hosius first booke, euen to the very place, where he  
 had befoze his allegations of Liberius, and Hosius Coz-  
 dubensis sayinges against Constantius the Emperour:  
 and there hath he borrowed this treatie of Leo Isaurus,  
 and Damascenus, trustings that no man would trace  
 him out, fetchinge suche longe leapes sozwarde, and  
 backwarde, as he doeth. And as befoze he starte soze-  
 warde from the Emperour Valentinian, vnto Basilus  
 the Emperour aboue. iij. hundzeth yēeres: so doeth he  
 here nowe likewise, from Constantius and Valens the  
 Emperours, starte sozward no lesse than. iij. hundzeth  
 yēeres. But what shoulde the man do, sēinge Hosius  
 his authour starteth no lesse: with whome M. Dozman  
 must nēdes start, or elles stande starke still, not hable to  
 goe one softe without him. But as befoze in the treatie  
 of the Emperour Basilus, so here in this of Leo Isau-  
 rus, & Damascenus, M. Dozman hath starte aboue tow  
 hundzeth yēeres out of the compasse of vi. C. yēeres af-  
 ter Christ, within the which compasse yet he promiseth  
 he would kēpe him selfe. And therefore it maketh no  
 great matter what Damascenus, being in those latter  
 corrupt times, manifestly mainteining manifest Idola-  
 trie, doth say in this matter. But the good Reader may

Hosius libr. 12  
 fol. 37. a. b.

Dorm. post fol.  
 51. 2.

Wh

well

well vnderstand to here Damascenus in his first and second sermons (out of the which are these sentences here by *D. Dozman* alleaged, taken) hath these wordes in effect. We will not suffer, that any man shall teach v a nue faith, for out of Sion shall the law proceede, and the worde of God out of Hierusalem, as saith the holy ghost by the Prophete. And againe: Christ did not geue the power of bindinge, & loosing vnto kinges, but to the Apostles, & their successours, &c. And againe: God saide to Dauid: Thou shalt not build my house, for because thou hast shedde blood, &c. And againe: Such inuasion of an others office is thy parte of robbers & theaues. Thus is it written in Damascene & Hosius too: though *D. Dozman* hath as you see, mollified thy matter, translating it thus: I can terme it no better my bretherne than robberie and plaine violence &c. And againe: I acknowledge him for no king, saith Damascene, that by tyrannie vsurpeth Priesthood, (which *D. Dozman* for his purpose termeth the Priestes office, trustinge thy some would beleaue him, that our Princes doe take vpon the Priestes offices, though no man would beleaue him, thy they doe take vpon them priesthood) these be Damascenes wordes in effect. Which wordes with the allegations of thy tearing of Samuels garment by king Saule, of the persecution of Iesabell, of Herode murtheringe John Baptist, of S. Germanus cruelly beaten, & banished, & many other Bishops with him: all these thinges doth Damascene I say, lay out against Leo the Emperour. By the which thy god Reader may wel vnderstand, thy this Leo tooke vpon him farre other wise, than doe our Christian Princes, who doe teach no nue faith, but doe mainteine the same law that proceeded out of Sion, the same worde of God, thy came out of Hierusalem: as Damascene

Damasc. ferm. i.  
Non patiemur  
vt nos aliquis  
noua fide edo-  
ceat, ex Sion eni  
egredietur lex  
& verbu Dni ex  
Hierusalem. &c.

Quia vir fan-  
guinum es.  
Eiusmodi alie-  
re functionis  
inuasio prædonu  
est & latronum.  
ô fratres.

Sacerdotium vs-  
urpat.

maseene requireth. Let the Pope see, y<sup>e</sup> this place touche  
 not him: who as he hath brought in a nue faith, hath  
 made nue lawes, whiche neuer proceeded from mount  
 Syon, but fro<sup>m</sup> S. Angels castell, neither are to be soude  
 in the worde of y<sup>e</sup> Lord, receiued fro<sup>m</sup> Hierusalē, but in y<sup>e</sup>  
 Popes worde, inforced vpon Christian men fro<sup>m</sup> Rome:  
 so by Damascene it seemeth y<sup>e</sup> such nue wicked faithes, &  
 lawes proceeding from Rome, must be abolished by the  
 law, & worde of God, proceeding from Hierusalem. To  
 proceede: our Princes inuade no other mens offices, thei  
 claime not the power of binding & losinge, but doe leaue  
 it to y<sup>e</sup> Apostles successours: neither doe they by tyrannie  
 vsurpe priesthode, but leaue it to the Priestes. Our  
 Princes haue tozne no Samuelles coate with Saule:  
 haue not persecuted with Iesabell: haue slaine no John  
 Baptist, oz other Saint, with Herode: haue beaten oz  
 banished no S. Germaine, oz other godly Bishop. Our  
 Princes are no thēues, robbers, oz murtherers. Let M.  
 Dozman lay these things to their charge, who are guiltie  
 of them, and specially to his Pope most guiltie of all  
 others. But there are besides these sayinges, in Da-  
 mascene, other things (will M. Dozman say) directly  
 against suche Princes, as intermedle with the state of  
 the Church, and for the traditions of the fathers, be  
 they w<sup>ri</sup>ten oz vnw<sup>ri</sup>ten. I knowe, there be suche  
 things M. Dozman, in Damascene: and so is there in  
 him manifest maintenauce of manifest Idolatrie to.  
 And no maruaile if he, who liued aboue. 800. yeres af-  
 ter Christ, in the whiche most corrupt times Priestes  
 had inuaded a mere tyrannie ouer other Christians,  
 did so corruptlie w<sup>ri</sup>te of this matier. Though  
 Damascene consented not that the Church shoulde be

Damascenus.  
 Eiusmodi alie-  
 ne functionis  
 inuasio, prædo-  
 num est & la-  
 tronum.

August. epist. 166  
ad Donatistas.  
Qui hoc facere  
noluit, quod ei  
per correptis ipsa  
veritas iussit, sibi  
iudicium acqui-  
rit &c.

governed by y<sup>e</sup> lawes of kinges : yet doth S. Augustine teach that, who so euer doth dispice the commandement of god and godly Emperours touchinge religion, procureth him selfe dānation, bicause he would not do that which the truth it selfe commaunded by the herte of the kinge : saith S. Augustine . And Justinians lawes in Churchē matiers, are yet to be seene in great plentie.

*Dorman. Fol. 27.*

And thus much hetherto good readers haue I thought good to reherce, that you may the better vnderstande how the auncient fathers of Christes Churchē, haue not ceased continually from time to time, to resiste the vnlawfull attempt of such Princes, as beinge heretikes or enueigled. theretoe by heretikes (for of other perdy it was neuer gone about, nor of all them neither) would contrary to the expresse woorde of God, the custome of Christes Churchē from the beginninge continued, the allowed examples of all ages, of all common weales Christian and heathen hetherto practised, mingle heauen and earth, holy and prophane together, by vnlawfull vsurpinge to them selues, the supreme and chiefe gouernement in causes ecclesiasticall.

*Nowell.*

Remember your wordes befoze M. Dorman, taken out of the prophet Esay. Woe be to them that call euell good, and good euell : and beware . For hitherto it hath seemed good to you, to do and say euell, of god Princes . And what so euer you coulde finde writen in the auncient fathers, against the vnlawfull attemptes of Princes, who were wicked haretiques, & tyrantes, you do wickedly and falsely applie to the due authoritie, & iust gouernement of god, Christian, and molte mercifull Princes, and to their moste godly and necessarie  
reforma

reformatiō, and restōring of true Religion (by you Papistes defaced) in the Churches of their owne dominions, accomplished according to the expresse woorde of God, and the examples of all aunient godly kinges, as well in the ould Lawe, as of the Christian Religion.

*Dorman. Fol. 27.*

*To come neare home to our owne time and daies, if in it any Prince have attempted the like, there hath not lacked also stoure of diuerse men, singuler both for their vertuous life and exquisite learning, whiche haue rather chosen to withstand the same with the expense of their blood, and losse of this present life, then to the utter destruction of both body and soule, and losse of that whiche must continue for euer, to consent thereto.*

*NaWell.*

That amongst the whole numbze of the Cleargie, and people of England some fewe were found, that did to the death sticke vnto their persuasion of the Popes supzernacie, whiche they had dronke in as it were, with their mothers milke, and were from their childhood continually confirmed in the same all their life, what maruel was that? The like zeale was to be founde in the Iues, and Ethnicks, whan they were by the Gospell called from their shadowes, superstitions, and errorrs to the true Christian Religion. And in the Iues the like remaineth this day. But this was the maruel that neither the continuance of longe custome, noz persuasion begonne in childhood, and most deeplie rooted by continuance, noz the examples of their progenitours, noz exhortations of their friendes, noz the terrour of Tyrantes, losse of goodes, and of life also, by moste cruell

H 3 death,

death, could stay either Iues, or Gentiles, as many as were appointed to saluatiō, from the receiuing of that true doctrine of the Gospell (as it was termed) so inauincible is the power of the truth. The same truth now by Gods grace shining most brightlie in the Gospell of our Saviour Christ, and reueling the errours of popery to the eyes of men, and women, of all degrees, and ages, hath such power with the childre of the light, that no inueterate custome of popishe errour, no continuāce of time, no examples of forefathers, no persuasions of frendes, no threathninges of Tyrantes, no losse of goodes, nor of life by mosse cruell death, coulde stave a thousande, for euery one, that you doe speake of, from embracing of the truth. For this is the peculiar praise of the truthe, that of it selfe, without these helpes, yea against all these lettes, it getteth the victorie in mens myndes. So that rather than they will forsake it, they will forsake auncient customes, oulde persuasiōs, goodes, landes, life and all.

Dorman. Fol. 27.

Hof. lib. 2. f. 106.  
Likewise obiectioneth Caluine as agreeing with the Papistes against vs in this pointe.

But if these examples please not the deinty tast of the aduersaries as being ouer stale: I shall set before them their owne deare darling, the pillar while he liued of their Religion, the verie head of their Church (if they be not altogether headlesse) their idol and their God in earth, whose doctrine and opinions at other times, and in other thinges, they haue so rauenslie deuoured, Iohn Caluin himselfe. For if kinges and temporall gouernours (as our aduersaries affirme) ought euerie one of them in their Realmes, signories, and dominions, to gouerne in causes Ecclesiasticall and matters of Religion: why did then that monstrous beaste in his comentarie vpon the Prophetes Osee and Amos, raile vpon our late soueraigne lorde kinge

In Osee.  
cap. 1.  
Henric Amos. 7.

Henric the eight, calling him homo belluinus a beaslie man, and comparing him with Iehu, & home he termeth wicked and nough? VVhy termed he the blasphemers that first burzed into his eares that vaine desire to be called chiefe head of the Church of England (for of other yo<sup>w</sup> wot well he neuer attempted to be nor euer was called) vnder Christe here in earth? If Caluin haue taught the truibe, then haue his scholers taught vs and yeat doe feeders with lies. If they were blasphemers that called king Henric chiefe head of the Church of England vnder Christ, (whiche is to saie in effect nothing elles but to be chiefe gouernour in all causes belonging to the same) who was yet a man although laie, and thereto also of great wisdom and learning: in what degree of blasphemie shall we place them, that giue this title not to lay men onely, but to women also and children without respect?

No well.

We mislike no auncient examples (whiche you call stale) so they be good. But that you lacked good examples: you shawe by your alleaging for you of the examples of Tyrauntes, Hæretikes, Apostatas, and Heathen men, and that you were destitute of the auncient examples of the primitiue Church, appeareth by your alleagatiõ of Basilus the Emperour, and of Damascenus, (who were in later and very corrupt times) and by your praiyng of aide at Caluins handes, a man so haited of you, that you could net dissemble your haitred so long, as you wold haue him to stand on your side, beswaiyng therein your disease, not hurting Caluin thereby: one part of whose true praysle is, that he misliketh suche as you are. Not Caluine, but Christe is the head of our Church, whiles Christe liueth, our Church shal not be headles. Caluin noz no other sozenar is chiefe gouernour

Dor. sup. fo. 23.  
24.

Fol. 23.

of our

of our Church under Christe (as is that sozaigne Romische Antichrist of your Synagoge,) but our owne naturall gracious foueraigne. Caluine though in deede a woꝛthy man, (whatsoever M. Dozman saith) but yet a man, was abused and deceiued by the wilie children of your worldly generation. And beinge so deceiued, did wyꝛte otherwyse of our late Soueraigne of famous memoꝛy, than the truthe was, and than he would haue done, had he not bene abused. Wherein it shall well appeare that they, who by guilful and vntrue reportes brought him thereunto, were moꝛe to blame than he: howe farre mallice is woꝛse then errour, and deceiuing woꝛse than credulitie. Let him selfe in the very places by you M. Dozman here alleaged, be a proufe of that I do say. Upon the seventh of Amos the Prophet: these be Caluines woꝛdes. *Et hodie quā multi sunt in papatu. &c.* And this day how many be there in y papish state, that do heape vpon kinges all authozitie and power that thei can, that no reasoning or disputing of Religion should be: but that this power should remayne in the king alone, to determine according to his mynd, whatsoeuer he listeth: and that his determination should stande firme and sure without all controuersie. Thus muche speaketh Caluin of Paptikes only. It foloweth immediatly: they who in the beginnunge did so highly sette vp Henry king of Englande, surely were inconsiderate men, they gaue him the supꝛeame power of all thinges, and that did euer grenouly wounde me. For they were blasphemous, when they called him the supꝛeame head of the Church vnder Christ. Surely this was to muche: but let it lie buried, for that they offended by inconsiderate zeale. These be Caluins woꝛds.

Whereby

Et sine contro-  
uersia hoc fixū  
maneat.

whereby it may appeare that he inconsiderately beleaued  
 suche, as gaue him this information: that with the title  
 of the supream head of the Church vnder Christ, there  
 was giuen withall to king Henrie the eight of famous  
 memoire, the supream authoritie and power of all  
 thinges, to determine what pleased him, in the church:  
 and that no disputing in Religion should be, but what  
 soeuer he determined, should stande firme & sure, with-  
 out any controuersie, or any great regarde had, either  
 to reason, or Scriptures. For that Caluine thus was  
 informed, and thus thought, and vpon that errour did  
 so vnworthely write of king Henrie the eight, is partly  
 by that whiche I haue of him already rehearsed, to be  
 vnderstanded, and shall be yet made moze playne. But  
 you will aske, who should so misinforme Caluine: will  
 you heare him selfe answer: It foloweth immediatly  
 after these wordes of Caluine befoze rehearsed, thus.  
 Sed vbi Impostor ille, qui postea fuit Cancellari⁹. &c.  
 that is to say: but when y<sup>e</sup> deceiuer, which was after-  
 ward Chaunceler (I speake of this last Chaunceler, that  
 was Bishop of Winchester) was at Ratisponne, he did  
 not contende with reasons, nor cared muche for the te-  
 stimonies of the Scripture: but he said, that it was in  
 the kinges pleasure to disanulle thinges decreed, and to  
 make new rites: that if orde shuld be taken concerning  
 fasting, the king might appointe and commaunde the  
 people to eate fleshe, this, or that day: that the kyng  
 might forbidde Priestes mariages, that the kyng also  
 might forbid the people the vse of the cup in the Lords  
 supper: that the king might do, and determine this or  
 that in his kingdome. Why so: for the king (saith he)  
 hath the supream power, Suche was the setned deuise

D. Steuen Gar-  
 dinct.

Statuere.

Commentum.

of this Amasias, of whom the Prophet speaketh in this place (of Amos the Prophet) and so furth. These be Calvins very wordes: whereby he be trayeth one of these misreporters of our late gracious Soueraigne, the Queenes moste fathers father, of moste noble memoize, and of the lawes of the Realme. Who, when he was moste desirous that the king should moste mislike of Calutne, and suche as he was, and of their doctrine: vnder the colour of houlding earnestly with the kinge, in talke and reasoning with them, wold attribute to the kinge moze than was geuen to him, or than he toke vpon him; moze than either reason wold allowe, or was agreable to the Lawes and state of this Realme, or the Lawe of God wold permit. Whereby, he first got an opinion of earnestnes of the kinges side, wherein was worldly sanctie. Next he greaved muche, and as Calvin saith, soze wounded the saide learned mens mindes, beinge Traungers, and beleauing that the kinge did so largely take vpon him, as he had reported. Thirdly, he trusted that thereupon some of them would write some thinge against the kinge, whiche in dede, as you here see, came to passe. And lastly, that the kinge offended thereby, should fall in displeasure with them, and in hatred of their doctrine, whiche no doubt, was earnestly laboured by D. Gardiner, and other workemen with him, in the late daies of the saide kinge of noble memoize, to be accomplished. Hea, and I pray God to pardon me, if I iudge amisse, where D. Steauen Gardiner Bishop of Winchester, in this matter was the moste forwardes man vpon the kinges side in apparaunce, that could be, he did both by word and writinge too much set foott the kinges authoritie, that he might by geuing him too muche

much, and by making the world to beleave that he took upon him no lesse, bringe him in to muche hatred with all the worlde, vnder the colour of muche loue to him, and earnestnes of his side. And if there were in the acte of Parliament, touching the kinges authoritie in matters Ecclesiasticall, any termes or wordes offensive to the ignozaunt and simple, they came in chiefly by his meanes: who was the chief in the penning of that submission of the whole Popishe Cleargie (than, by depending vpon the Popes authoritie contrarie to the lawes of God and the Realme, wholly fallen in the case of præmunire) who first gaue to the king that title of supzeme head, mosse ample, and fully. But that such his earnestnes, & doinges were not frõ the heart, he declared after ward by his earnest and heartie dealing to the contrarie: geuinge thereby to wylle men occasion to thinke, that he therfoze in talke, and report had geuen befoze to the king moze than was reason, and thã was geuen him in dõde by act of Parliament, (geuing onely laifull authoritie to him) and suche as was by the auncient Lawes of the Realme, befoze of right to him apperteining, to bringe ignozaunt men in opinion, that the act of Parliament did geue him moze than was reason, to thende that he might seeme with reason afterwarde, to take it awaye from his chyldzen and successors.

Nowe lette vs see the truthe touchinge Caluine. Caluin saith, it wounded him very soze, that some gaue the supzeme power ouer all thinges to king Henry the eight, & y they were blasphemous, whẽ they called him the supzeme head of the Church vnder Chyriste. Is it

not evident by Calvins owne owne woordes, that he tooke it, that in callinge him the supream head of the Church, they gaue him the supream power ouer all, that at his will and pleasure he might do and vndo, bynde and loose, what he listeth, without any great regarde of reason, or testimonies of the Scripture: and that whatsoeuer the king should so at his pleasure determine, the same should remaine firme and sure without all controuersie: As the examples of D. Gardiner his argumentes afoze cited, do manifestly declare. But mooste certen it is, that no suche thinge was geuen to king Henrie, with that title of Supream head of the Church vnder God or Christe, by the act of Parliament, whiche geueth him no suche authoritie, as is vnlawfull for any Iudge Ecclesiasticall, or Tempozall to execute. Neither was any suche thinge geuen to the kyng by the Protestantes, who by the woordes vnder God or vnder Christe, adioyned in that style, euer tooke it them selues, and taught others that he had none authoritie geuen him, thereby to do any thinge contrarie to God or Christes lawe, vnder whome he was declared to be. Onely Doct. Steauen Gardiner Bishop of Winchester, and suche as he was of the Popeshe Cleargie

(for saith Caluine many in the poperie do heape vpon kinges all the authoritie and power they can) did, for y causes befoze exprested, pretend & repozte that with the title of supream head of the church, the supream power ouer al, to do in the church what he listeth, without any great regarde to reason, & without testimonies of y scriptures, was geue to y king: where as no such thing was geuen him, noz he tooke no such thing bypon him.

What

Caluinus ibidē.  
Multi in papa-  
tu regib<sup>9</sup> accu-  
malāt quicquid  
possunt iuris &  
potestatis, &c.

What was it therefore that wounded Caluine so grieuouſlie: forſoꝛth the false pꝛactenſe and report of D. Steauen Gardiner, and ſuch other papifſtes. Who were than blaſphemous in geuinge the king the title of ſupꝛeame head, with ſuch a ſenſe, that he might thereby do what he liſted in the Church of Chriſte: D. Steauen Gardiner and ſuch like Papifſtes. This is the truth: and Caluine himſelfe declarerth this to be the truth: thoſe popiſh Biſhoppes were thoſe blaſphemers, that he ſpeaketh of. In deede Caluine who ſaith, they were inconsiderate that gaue to the kinge the ſupꝛeame power ouer all, did inconsideratly beleue the false reportes of ſuche ſubtile pꝛactiſing fores, ſo bearing him in hande, and thereupon did write as he did. And do not you M. Dozman and your maifſter D. Hardinge, reporting and writing, that we would make the feete the head, and the head the feete. That we teach that our Princes be heads of the Church and not me- Dorm. ſupra. fol. 16. b. bres, to rule and not to be ruled in cauſes of Religion: that to them it belongeth in the right of their crowne, to approue doctrine, or to condemne it, to alter at their pleaſure the ſtate of Religion &c. as maifſters in Religion. And that our Princes by takinge ſo vpon them, Dorm. ſupra. fol. 26. a. uſe a point of Antichriſtianiſme, and mingle heauen and earth together. And that we confounde the offices of ſpirituall gouernours, and temporall magiſtrates: that our preſumptuous heades D. Hard. Cõfute Apol. fol. 7. 298. & 299. woulde that Princes ſhould take vpon them the office of Biſhoppes, and of the Pope himſelfe. Do not I ſay, your Maifſter, and you, thus reporting, goe about by ſuch false ſclaunders, now to bringe men ignozant of the truth, into a like opinion of our Prince, and vs, as was Caluine brought into by D. Steauen Gardiner, and others: and thereby as much as in you lieth, to procure learned men (though in doctrine agreeing with vs, as in deede did Caluine)

vpon the credite of suche vnttrue reportes, so write a-  
 gainst our Prince and vs, as than did Caluine: But  
 what if any so by you deceiued, should write of vs, as  
 you mosse falsely reportes: that we be *beastly flatterers, hell  
 houndes, confounders of all, minglers of heauen and earth holy  
 and prophane things together, guiltie of sacrilege and Anti-  
 christiansme*. Should we therefore be so: or shoulde not  
 you rather be (as you are) false sclaunderers: and they,  
 so beleuinge of you, should be inconsiderate men, and  
 light of credite, if they shoulde, vpon your reportes,  
 write against vs, with whome in dede they do agree  
 in doctrine, euen in this very pointe of doctrine, as  
 doth also Caluine agree herein with vs: as hath part-  
 ly heretofore, where you charge vs with him, as con-  
 trarie to vs, and shall yet hereafter moze plainely ap-  
 peare. Touchinge the ages, and seres of Princes,  
 where at you do also quarell: the same right, the same  
 authozitie, (though not the same knowledge, and ex-  
 perience) hath a yonge Prince, that hath an olde: the  
 same right and authozitie hath an absolute Quene, as  
 hath a Kinge. And he that saide that Kinges shoulde  
 be nutrice foster Fathers, saithe also, that Quenes  
 shoulde be nutrices, nurces, or foster mothers of the  
 Churche. And he that will diligently reade the hi-  
 stories Ecclesiasticall shall finde that the yonge Kinge  
 Josias, and also the Emperesse Pulcheria, though a  
 very yonge Ladie, did as prudently, and profitably  
 gouerne, the one, the kingdome of Iurie, the other, the  
 Emperre, and Churche of God, in the noneage of her  
 brother, as it was lightly at any time, by any graue  
 and god Kinge, or Emperour before, or sithen gouer-  
 ned.

Herm. Sozom.  
 lib. 9. cap. 1. & c.

Dorman Fol. 28.

If Caluin, who touching the geuinge of this vnlaifull title to our late lorde and maister was viterly innocent, complained yet that euen his conscience was wounded not a little there withall: how much more daügerously wounded ought thei to thincke them selues, who of so many horrible and bloudy woundes (whereby for the refusall to folow this example in Christes Church neuer harde of before, so many godly, learned and innocent men in this realme haue died: some by headinge, some by hanginge, some by quarteringe and tearinge peace meale one membre from an other, haue by there false and vntreue suggestions, byn the chiefe and onely occasion? who yet like cruell murderinge bloudsuckers and bloudy bourreaus, carry about in their murderinge and malicious. mouthes the naked knife, whiche were it laifull for them they woulde sheath in the throates of euery one of vs that thincke not as they doo.

Nowell.

Who wounded Caluines conscience I haue before declared: euen the sclaunderous and vntreue reportinge Papistes: euen such as is here D. Dorman, who is not ashamed vpon so light an occasion, or rather none at all, as not geuen, but sought vpon the worde of wounding of Caluines conscience, so horribly to discourse vpon our crueltie (whiche is none) with suche earnestnes, as the more vehemet it is, & more ridiculous it proueth. But if we, who hitherto haue shedde no mans blood, by cruel murthering, bloudsuckers, & bloudie bourreaus &c. what be you Papistes who haue so cruellie murthered so many thousandes by the moste terrible kinde of death that the Deuell, and you could deuise, after you had of longe pined them in prison, and not set, but hanged them in stocks, and prons, by seete, handes, and necke, & other wise.

wise intollerably tormented them: Remembze **P. Doz** man that he, who is so readie to see a mote in an other mans eye, shuld first looke to his owne beame: if so great a beame, as you haue, would suffer you to see. **D** that we had a man of your eloquence on our side, that he might yet in some parte set forth the raginge, rane-ninge, and insatiable bloudthirstie crueltie of that pur-pured Trompet, the romishe Antichrist, your Pope, and his popishe Prelates, more redde with blood, of men, women, and children, by them murthered, than with scarlet and purple clothes: whose vnspeakeable cru-eltie, no office of tonge or penne can woꝛthely expresse. **W**hat you speake of the chiefe and onely occasion by vs geuen, is most vntreue. No men were more foꝛewarde than the very pillars of your religion, as by their woꝛdes, and woꝛkes yet extaunt, it doeth appeare. **A**nd whan you speake of occasion of murther, remembze sith the first claime of this supꝛemacie by your romishe pope firste made continuinge to this day, and now by you mainteined by fire & sworde, of how many thousandes of most cruell murthers, it hath bene not the occasion onely, but the very chiefe and onely cause. **W**here you speake of our crueltie, that we would vse, were it law-ful for vs, is an vnlkely coniecture: your dedes are knowe, and your most cruell hartes by your dedes: and you thereby to be the children of that great homicide, & murthering manqueller your father. **W**ho so euer will remembze those milde fathers, **D. Cranmer**, **D. Ridley**, and **D. Latimer**, sometimes Bishops of Canterburie, London, and Worcester, & in fauour with their Pꝛince, how farre they were from all crueltie them selves, and fro mouing their Soueraigne thereto, yea how readie they

VVinton. de ve-  
ra obedientia,  
cum prefatione  
D. Boneri.  
Tostallus in cō-  
cione, corā Hé-  
rico. 8. Anglice  
impressa.

they were to moue him to all clemencie: & withhall will cōpare in his minde thzæ others on the contrarie parte, with them thzæ: and so by their example, compare all with all on both sides: may easely vnderstande on which side the cruell bloodsuckers, and bloudie bourreans were. Unlesse D. Dorman will so terme them who vsinge all others most gently, were moste cruellie murdered them selves: & by the same reason, he may terme those that so vsed them, innocent, meeke, & milde, harmeles lambes, God wotte.

*Dorman. Fol. 28.*

But if now on the contrary parte their maister Caluin were deceauid, if they be in the right and he in the Wronge, why steppeth none of them foorth, to defende and vindicate. from perpetuall infamy, that prince of famousse memory whiche by his railing writings this wretched caytife goeth about to bringe him into? why haue they left him so longe vndefended, who did no other thinge then whereof them selues were the authours and firste beginners? Or why at the least purge theie not them selues, of the horrible crime of blasphemie laied by him to their charges, and all suche as theie are? for if they were blasphemers that called kinge Henrie head of the Churche of Englande, what priuilege haue these that callinge not onely him, but his sonne and daughter by the same title in effect, they shoulde not incurre the same crime? VVhere is now their spirite of vnitie that they are wont so muche to bragge of, whiche dissent not here in any small point, or from any meane man, but euen from the chiefest caterpillar (whyle he liued) of their congregation? who not onely in these places before by me alleaged keepeth as it were with their proceedinges a combat, but elles where

in his Institutions doeth merueilously discreditte the same.

Itis

No well.

Nowell.

Caluine was deceiued, not in his iudgement of this doctrine (wherein he agreeth with vs) but in y<sup>e</sup> crediting of the false reportes of liynge Papistes. He laieth blasphemie to the charge of such onelie, as with that title of supream heade, gaue to the king supream power ouer all in Christes Church to do what he liste. Those he sheweth by ons, who they al were, euen you Papistes, as I haue declared. If vpon vnderstandinge that some simple men mistooke the title of supream head of the Church, it was afterwarde, for their sake mollified by these wordes, chiefe gouernour &c. and an admonition also to the simple by the malitious deceiued, was to the same added, al whiche not withstanding, you here twise in one lease do quarell at the same, and in this treatie continually so do: you shewe your selfe to be of that sorte of the malitious, that will neither be admonished your selfe, nor will suffer the simple to take admonition.

Touthinge the defending of King Henrie the eight of moste noble memorie, whiche you require of vs M. Doorman, his worthines needeth not our defence. And were there any neede of our defence, we shoulde rather haue bled it against suche false Papistes, his vnttrue subiectes, as continually out of all pulpettes, with reproches not to be named, railed vpon him, their late most gracious and redoubted Soueraigne. These and their railinges yet almoste soundinge in the eares of men, and abhorred of all god men, you that espyed a place or twaine in afozenars writings, coulde not heare, nor see. And you, selow to them, that thus did, false subiectes

to their good Prince, conuersant in that Citie, and especially in that Popishe Synagoge, where bothe by w<sup>ords</sup> The Charthous-  
 tinges and pictures vpon the walles, the leude display- ans in Louaer.  
 ses, and mosste false reproches of that most wort<sup>hy</sup> Prince, are mosste vnwort<sup>hy</sup>ly set out to the eies of m<sup>e</sup>: befoze the whiche pictures you papistes as many of you as be Priestes, do deuoutly say your blasphemous masses: you that haue by w<sup>ronge</sup> suggestions procured priuileges in p<sup>rinted</sup> bookes, to blotte (as muche as in you lieth) the noble fame of our, and your mosste gracious Quene, and naturall Soueraigne, with spottes of plaine violence, and robbetrie, of sacrilege, and Antichristianisme, and of minglinge of heauen and earth together: and what not elles: You I say, who shoulde be true subiectes, and therefore farre from these partes, thus doinge your selles, do yet aske of vs, *why we steppe not forth to defende, and vindicate the fame of our late mosste noble Kinge deceased, against the raylinges of one straunger and foraigne writer deceiued. & now likewise him selfe deceased also:* you, I say, do aske this, who do procure vs so much, and to much a do in spounginge out of the spottes and blottes, wherewith you her subiectes yet liuing, do attempt to disseine the mosste wort<sup>hy</sup> and noble fame of her maiestie, yet liuinge, (immortall thanks be to God therfoze) & longe & longe by his grace yet to liue. And we do confesse, that were not her wort<sup>hines</sup> a bone all malice, and sclaunders of Papistes, we should haue enough, and to much a do, to answere the continuall sclaunders of such vnnaturall subiectes, yet liuinge: so litle leasure leaue you vs, to deale with the mistreportes of one straunger dead, and by the false reporte of suche lypnge subiectes, as you now are, whiles

he liued, deceiued, and so induced so to write.

Touching the purging of our selues of the blasphemie, I haue done it already, and proued that Caluine chargeth therewith not vs, but the Papisstes.

Concerninge the dissention betwene Caluine and vs, wherewith M. Dozman chargeth vs, I say there is none: and that Caluine & we do agree in this doctrine of the chiefe gouernance of Chzistian Princes in causes Ecclesiasticall. And thus I do proue it.

First Caluine vpo the prophet Deas by M. Dozma here alleaged, saith thus: Si quispiam Rex studio gloriae Dei propagandae ardeat, dabit operam vt subditos oēs suos contineat in puro cultu. &c. that is to say: If a kinge haue an earnest desire to set forth the gloire of God, he will endenour him selfe to keepe all his subiectes in the pure worshippinge of God. These be Caluines wordes. Where you see firste that Caluine teacheth that a godly Prince may and will keepe all his subiectes, without exception of any, in the true worshippinge of God. And that is the very same, that we say: and by these very wordes he alloweth, as we do, our gracious Soueraigne, goinge likewise aboute to keepe all her subiectes in the true worshippinge of God: which can be done none other wise, but by causing of Bishoppes to do their duetie, and if they will not, to see others that will, placed.

Againe in the fourth booke of his Institution here and befoze by M. Dozman alleaged, Caluine hath these wordes: Vniuersale conciliū indicere solus Imperator poterat &c. The onely Emperour coulde summon a generall councill. If any Bishoppe shoulde haue attempted it, they woulde not onely haue disobeyed, who

were

Caluinus in. 7.  
Hofex fol. 87.

Caluinus Instit.  
ut. lib. 4. ca. 7.  
Sect. 8.

were without his prouince: but a tumulte also would haue risen theresol: therefore the Emperour commaunded all indifferently that they should be present. And againe, a litle after the same place he saith. *Gregorius Papa Aquileiensem Episcopum iubet quidem. &c.* Ibidē Sect. 13. Pope Gregorie, did in deede commaunde the Bishop of Aquileia to come to Rome, to answere in a controuerſie of faith, risen betwene him and others: yet did he not so commaunde him by his owne power, but because the Emperour had so commaunded. Thus far Caluin.

And here also Caluine agreeth with vs, that the bishop of Rome hath no authoritie of him selfe, to call either a Synode or councill, or any one Bishoppe out of his owne prouince, but by the Emperours commaundement, or commission.

And againe, in the same place he saith. *Gregorius officium pastoris si non explebat. &c.* Pope Gregorie though he did not thoroughly the office of a Bishop, yet he did it (as he might) he abstained from the gouerning of ciuile empire or dominion: and acknowledged him self with others to be the Emperours subject: he thrust not him selfe into y care, or intermedling with other churches, but when he was so compelled by necessitie. Thus farre Caluine: wherein he agreeth with vs, iustly charging the Popes that nowe be, for not doinge the office of Bishops, for taking vpon them ciuill Dominion: for withdrawing them selues from the subiection of their lafull Lozde and soueraigne, the Emperour: who beinge in deede his subiectes, doe offer vnto their Lozde their ſete to kille: whiche intollerable presumption and arrogancie was neuer yet by any prince vsed towarde their subiectes. Further, Caluine decla-

reth that the olde Bishoppes of Rome did neuer but by  
 pon necessitie, that is as he befoze declared, vpon the  
 Emperours commaundement oz commission, inter-  
 medle in other Bishops diocesses.

Touching appeales, and authoritie in the hearing,  
 and endinge of controuersies arisinge in the Church  
 betwene Bishoppes: Caluin alleageth the example of  
 the Emperour Constantinus, befoze whom the cause  
 betwene Cæcilianus Bishop of Carthage, and Dona-  
 tus, after sentence befoze geuen therein by Bishoppes,  
 was brought: the Emperour assigned the matier to be  
 heard and determined by Melchades Bishop of Rome,  
 soyning to him as Colleges. certen Bishoppes of Italy,  
 Fraunce, and Spaine, who pronounced vpon Bishop  
 Cæcilianus his side. But Donatus not contented with  
 that iudgement, appealed to the Emperour Constanti-  
 nus: who assigned the iudgemēt of the apeale to y<sup>e</sup> Bi-  
 shop of Arle in Fraunce, who sate iudge, to geue sentēce  
 as he thought good, after the B. of Rome. Thus farre  
 Caluine, vpon y<sup>e</sup> which processe he gathereth. ij. things.

1. The first, that it was not the ordinarie iurisdiction of  
 the see of Rome to heare appeales in causes Ecclesiasti-  
 cal: both for that he suffered other Colleges, at y<sup>e</sup> Em-  
 perours pleasure and assignement, to be soyned with  
 him: and for that him selfe toke vpon him the iudgemēt,  
 rather by the Emperours commaundement, than by  
 his owne right oz office.

2. The second, that the Romain see had not the supre-  
 me power without appellation, seinge the Bishop of  
 Arles was preferred befoze him. And thus saith Cal-  
 uin, did that Emperour (Constantinus) whom y<sup>e</sup> Popes  
 doe bragge to haue bestowed not onely all his diligence,  
 but

Ibidem sect. 10.  
 Accusauerat  
 Cæcilianū Car-  
 thaginensē epif.  
 Donatus a cassi  
 nigris, &c.

Impatoris arbi-  
 trio.

Quæ ex officio  
 suo.

but also almost all the riches of the Empire, to the amplifying of the dignitie of their see. Thus farre Caluine trulle translated. And S. Augustine also out of whom Epist. 166. Caluine alleageth this proesse, declareth that finally the Emperour him selfe ended and determined this controuerſie Ecclesiasticall, betwene Bishop Cæcilianus and Donatus : as I haue before declared.

Howe if it please M. Dozman to aske, *where is that spirit of unitie, whiche we reioyse in?* (not bragge of, as he saith) we say, it is here to be seene in that very point of doctrine, with dissention wherein M. Dozman so braggingly, and falsely, chargeth vs.

We say that godly Christian Princes may, and ought to keepe all their subiectes in the true woorthyping of God, or in true Religion : Caluine saith so too. We say that Christian Princes haue power to call Bishops to Synodes or counsels: Caluine saith the same. We say, whan the B. of Rome or any other Bishop, calleth an other before him out of his owne Prouince, to answer in a cause of faith, he doth it not by his owne power, but by the Christian Princes authoritie : soe saith Caluine also.

We say, that the Pope, and other Prelates ought not to intermedle with ciuill regiment, and that the Pope is subiect to the Emperour, and other Bishops to their naturall Princes: and so saith Caluine too.

We say, that if a Bishop be oppressed by the wrongfull iudgement of other Bishops (as was Cæcilianus Bishop of Carthage) that he may appeale to a Christian Prince, vnder whome he and they doe lyue: that the saide Prince may assigne what deligates he shall thinke good to heare the cause, specially of the  
Clergie.

Clergie, as did Constantinus: and if they can not ende it, that the said Prince may assigne other delegates, for the determining of this matter: and that the saide delegates do not by their owne, but by the Princes authoritie deale and proceede in suche matters: and the same saith Caluine too.

And S. Augustine Caluins authour herein, by the example of Constantinus the Emperour, giueth vs further to vnderstande, that the Christian Prince, may if he wil, end & finally determine, such cōtrouersies Ecclesiastical in his own person. Besides these poinctes: Caluine calleth y<sup>e</sup> Christian Prince Gods Vicar, & affirmeth that the state of the Church, and care of Religion, to restore it decayed, to mainteine it restored, according to Gods Lawe, doth apperteyne to godly and Christian Magistrates and Princes, euen as we do, as hath been before declared. These thinges do plainly proue, that Caluine agreeth with vs in this doctrine of the chiefe gouernement of Christian Princes in causes Ecclesiastical: and that M. Dozman so triumpheth bypon our dissention, whiche is none, without cause. His authour Hosius, who occasioned him to seeke dissentiō betwene Caluine and vs in this poincte, could yet finde so litle matier for his purpose, that he saith, *In hac re nobiscū potius quam tecum sentire videtur Calvinus*. In this matier, Caluinus seemeth to agree with vs rather than with thee, speaking to Brentius. This is all that Hosius thought might be said with any shamefastnes: so farre of is it, that he glozieth as doth M. Dozman of our dissention, whiche, Hosius well perceined by Caluins plaine doctrine to be none in deede. For, touching Caluins woordes, it is euident how that he beinge de-

ceined

Infti. li. 4. ca. 20  
sect. 4. & 9.

Hosius. lib. 4.  
fol. 106. a.

refused by the false reportes of subtle Papistes, did write so of our late gracious soueraigne, of his owne greauous wound, & of the blasphemy of others: whiche, (had he knowen the truthe) he would neuer haue done. And that do our aduersaries well knowe, who had rather quarell about a worde slipped from a straüger deceiued, than to knowe the truthe clearly set soorth in the actes of parliament, and to vnderstande by Caluins plaine declarations, his agréing both with the tenure of the saide actes, and our doctrine also touchinge the same. But let vs heare how Caluins yet further, (as saith **D. Dorman**) doth meruailously discreedit vs.

*Dorman. Fol. 28.*

And in steede of manie places whiche might be brought here out of his woorkes: I shall onely for this tème be contented to alleage one, in suche sorte as I finde it in the Frenche, because at the writing hereof I had not, nor could get anie other copie. The place is thus: Pour tant ceulx qui despouillent l'Eglise de ceste puissance, pour exalter le magistrat, ou la iustice terriene, non seulement corrompent le sens des paroles de Christe par faulse interpretation, mais aussi accusent d'une grande vice, les sainctz euesques qui ont esté en grand nombre, depuis le temps des Apostres, comme si ilz eussent vsurpé la dignité & office du magistrat, subz faulste couerture.

That is to saie in englishe. Those therefore which to exalt the magistrate or earthly iustice, do spoile the church of his power (he meaneth and speaketh of the ordre touching church matters) do corrupt not onelie the sense of Christes owne woordes by false interpretation, but doo also accuse of a heinous faulte the holie bishops, (wherof the nombre is not small) whiche haue bin sence the Apostles time, as though they had vsurped by false colouring the matter, the office and dignitie of the magistrat.

*Al. Nonne*

Nowe chose good Readers, whether ye had rather beleue Caluins mainteining the auctoritie and iurisdiction of the Church, or our clauwebackes and parasites which impugne the same.

No well.

M. Dozman, as at the writing hereof he could not possible get any Latine copie of Caluins institution, no moze could he at the printing of y<sup>e</sup> same at Antwerps finde any: as where Latine booke are very scarce, and Caluins institution, so; blodd by like by y<sup>e</sup> inquisition in Latine, was onely suffered to be had in Frenche.

But will you knowe the matter: M. Dozman would not onely haue you to know that he is a Bachelor, but that he is, or would be a gentleman also: and therefore he listd here to speake Frenche, and he doth comenly call vs by a Frenche terme of reproche, Huguenotes, & some where bloudie Bozreans. And can you now say, that M. Dozman is not skilled in many languages: In dede I can speake no Frenche: but I find in the same booke, chapter, & section of the Latine institution of Caluine, here by M. Dozman alleaged, that the wordes in this place by hym Englished, are by Caluine spoken vpon the wordes of our Sausour, Amen dico vobis; quaecunq; ligaueritis sup terra &c. that is to say: verely I say to you: whatsoever you do binde vpon earth, shall be bonden in heauen: and whatsoever you do loose in earth, shall also be loosd in heauen. They (saith Caluine vpon these wordes) who to adourne the magistrate, do spoile the Church of this power (to say, of binding and loosing befoze mentioned) do not onely corrupt the sense of Christes wordes, by false interpretation: but also condemne all holy Bishoppes &c. But we neuer gaue this power of binding and loosinge to the Magistrate, no; spoiled the Church thereof, but do leaue it wholly

wholly to the Church. Ergo, we neither corrupt the sense of those wordes of Christ, touching binding and loosing: nor condemne the holy Bishops &c. Ergo, M. Dozmann, where he saith that Calvin meaneth by this power *the ordre touching church matters*, by such generallitie, going about to drawe the readers from the speciall matter of binding and loosing, here spoken of by Calvin, into this error, that Calvins shuld speake indifferently or generally, of the ordering of al church matters, both herein by a false parenthesis corrupt the sense, and true meaning of Calvins wordes, thereby to make a show, as though Calvin did herein discēt frō vs, with whom he doth fully agrēe. And M. Dozmann him self cleareth the matter befoze, by these very wordes. *The power to excommunicate and absolve, our saviour gave to his Apostles, when he said to them: whatsoeuer you binde in earth, shall be bounde in heauen: and whatsoeuer you loose on the earth, shall be loosed in heauen. Vvherein, and in preaching, & ministering the sacraments, because these penitentiators praetred not as yet, any great title for Princes; I will leaue the both, as by our aduersaries them selues not assaulted. These be M. Dozmanns wordes, whereby he confesseth y we make no title for princes touching binding and loosing (whereof Calvin here speaketh) neither do assaulte the same, but do leaue it in the quiet possessiō of the clergie & church. And yet now y man bringeth in this notable place of Calvin in steede of manie, and that in Frenche also, and thereupō biddeth the good readers chose who thei had rather follow: Calvin maineinig & defendig by the scriptures, the autoritie & iurisdiction of the church, or our clawbackes saith he, and parasites, which impugne the same. These are M. Dozmanns wordes against these clawbackes: who befoze acknowledged that they do not impugne nor assault the same. This dealing of their proour will (I belsane) make some his selowe Papists, for*

Dot. sup. fo. 19. b

very shame to clawe & scratche to where it itcheth not.  
 And I doubt nothing but that all discrete Readers  
 will by this his alleaging of this one place in Reade of  
 many, as most notable to shewe thereby the dissention  
 betwene Caluine and vs, and so as he saith maruel-  
 lously to discredit vs, will credit that M. Dozman  
 had in deede no place at all, whereby he coulde proue  
 any dissention betwene vs, and that there is no chosse  
 left, but that whosoever will beleaue Caluine, must  
 also beleaue vs, as herein agreeing with vs, and we  
 with him. And that by this one place for all alleaged,  
 they will take the better heede to all other his allega-  
 tions: and by knowing of this one Papistes so guilt-  
 les dealing, will beware of them all. But vntill M.  
 Dozman can proue that Caluine teacheth that Chri-  
 stian Princes may not ouerse the Bishops and Cler-  
 gte within their owne dominions, that they doo their  
 duttie accordinge to Gods woorde: that they may not  
 correcte, punish, depose or depriue the said Bishoppes,  
 or other of y<sup>e</sup> Clergte, not doing their duttie accordinge  
 he: that they may not summe Bishoppes and others  
 of the Clergte to Synodes or counceils, gouerne them  
 assembled, approue and authorize thinges in suche Sy-  
 nodes agreed vpon: that they may not receiue appeales  
 in controuersies in the Clergte, and in causes Eccle-  
 siasticall, assigne conuenient Delegates, or vnto  
 them conuenient counsell, for the hearinge and de-  
 termininge of the same: when I saie, M. Dozman  
 can proue that Caluine teacheth that Christian Prin-  
 ces may not doo these thinges, which we doo af-  
 firme they may doo, than let M. Dozman inquire of  
 our spiritie of dultie, and bragge of our dissention.

But

Qui vult norit  
 omnes nouerit.

But sure I am that nether M. Dozman nor other papiste is hable to make any proufe thereof: and that therfore this is a causeles and mosse vaine bragge of M. Dozmans.

Dorman. Fol. 29.

The one hath scripture to defende it. The other hath nothing to assaule it. The scripture saith that in doutefull questions we should resort to the Priestes, that at their woordes should all matters be decided, that they should indge, that at their handes we should demaunde knowledge, that their lippes be the keepers thereof because they are our lordes angels. Now commeth the heretike, the peruerter of scripture, he telleth vs that we must seke it at the Princes handes, that he is Goddes chiefest ministre in thinges and causes as well Ecclesiasticall as Temporall.

Out of Hofius  
lib. 2. fol. 97. b.  
& 98. a.

Nowell.

Here is a summarie reherfall of all that hath bene hitherto alleaged by M. Dozman, and first out of the Scriptures. And it is ridiculous that he maketh his repetition in Caluins name, sayinge: Caluine hath Scripture to defende it, that is to defende M. Dozmans purpose against vs: where he can bringe no one place of Scripture by Caluine alleaged with him or against vs. But in the Scriptures, not by Caluine, but by M. Dozman alleaged as against vs, out of Leviticus. Deuteronomium, and Ezechiel, the matters by the Priestes to be decided are outwarde & ceremoniall matters, touching cleanes or vncleanes of fowle, fishe, beastes &c. touching diseases, & priuile murders, &c. Wherewith, as now beinge cleane abolished, or to other men than Priestes appertaininge, the ministers of the new testamēt

Leuit. 10.  
Deuter. 17.  
Ezechiel. 44.

ment haue nothing to do: either els the office of teaching & instructinge Goddes people is by the said Scriptures to the Priestes cōmended, & commaunded, which office we neuer denied to our Priestes, but euer lamented y they gaue them selves to idleness, & ignorance, leauing the said office. Now whereas they stande bounde to teach the Lordes law, not their owne phantasies, and to iudge according to Goddes wōrde, euer staine their iudgementes in Goddes iudgement, it is euident that if they passe their commission, here is no cōmandement to binde men to obediēce to them therein. The wōrdes folowinge touchinge the Priestes lippes are not in Aggæus the prophete here by M. Doorman noted, but in Malachias. And in neither of these prophetes Aggæus or Malachie, is there any promise that the lippes of Priestes shoulde not faile to keepe knowledge, (as M. Doorman vntruely hath reported befoze) neither any affirmation that their lippes be keepers of knowledge, as he saith here, but cleane cōtrary, that the lippes of the Priestes had failed from all knowledge, had erred and caused the people to erre. Wherefoze they are rebuked for not doinge their duetie: for (saith the prophete) the lippes of the Priestes shoulde keepe knowledge, for that they are the Angelles, or messengers of the Lorde, but you haue donne cleane contrarie: wherefoze I will make you to be in contempt saith the Lorde, &c. Wherefoze M. Doorman, he is no hæretique, nor peruerter of the scriptures (as you terme him) but the maintainer and solower of the Scriptures, who teacheth that the Priestes thus teachinge not the Lordes law, but their owne phantasies: not accordinge to Goddes wōrde, but mans inuentions: not staine in Goddes iudgementes, but

Leuit. 10. Doceatisque filios Israel omnia legitima mea.

Deuter. 17. Et facies quodcumque dixerint & docuerint te iuxta legē eius. Ezechiel. 44.

Cū fuerit cōtroversia stabū in iudicijs meis & iudicabū, leges meas & præcepta mea &c. custodient.

Malach. 2.

caried

caried by their owne affections: not keeping true knowledge, but hauinge grosse ignozaunce in their lippes, and heades too, are no mæte noꝝ competent iudges in matters of Religion. And in this case, I say, he that teacheth that godly and Christian Princes, ought to rebuke, correct and punish such Priestes, and either bring them to the doinge of their duetie, or if they be incorrigible, to see other placed that can, and will teache the people, to the said Princes charge by God committed, accordinge to Goddes worde, is no heretique, no peruerter of the Scriptures (though M. Dozman say he so be) but the teacher of the truth, and maintainer of the Scriptures. Neither hath Caluue (in whose name he ridiculouſlie maketh this reherſall conclusion) any Scripture against suche teachers, but saith the same him selfe in his expositions of the Scriptures, by M. Dozman alleaged: affirminge that a godly Prince will gene his diligẽce to containe all his subiectes in the true worſhippinge of God, and right Religion. And thus much for the Scriptures by him alleaged out of the oulde Testament.

Caluue in Ho-  
ſex. 7. fa. 81.

Dorman. Folia. 29.

*The Scripture reaçoneth in the first place in Christs church apostles, that is to say, Priestes (for we may not thincke that in that place the Apostle described a forme of the church to endure but for that onely age). The heretike will haue Princes placed aboue and Priestes beneath. The holy ghost appointed Bis hoppes and priestes to gouerne the stocke of Christs, that is the Church. The Diuell in his members appointeth ciuile magistrates to rule, and Priestes to obey. So that hereby we may most evidently see, how manifestly they peruert and corrupt the true sense and meaninge of Gods woorde.*

Out of Hofius  
lib. 2. fol. 98. 2.

No Well.

No Well.

1. Corinth 12.  
Ephes. 4.

Now concerning the Scriptures of the new Testa-  
ment. The rehearsal of the Ecclesiasticall ministers by  
S. Paule in his epistle to the Corinthians by M. Doz-  
man alleaged, (& to the Ephesians) so diligently made,  
& as M. Dozman saith, describing a forme of the Church  
to endure and continue, hauing no mentio of one head  
Priest of Christs whole Church ouer al others, but an  
æqualitie of the Apostles, and consequently of their suc-  
cessours Bishoppes, doth mosse effectuously ouerthrow  
M. Dozmanns proposition of the necessitie of one head  
Priest, for the prouise wherof it was brought: and so te-  
stifieth Caluine vpon these places of the Scripture, in  
whose name M. Dozman bringeth in these Scriptures  
as against vs.

True it is that Princes, who were than not Chri-  
stened, neither haue, nor could haue any place, muche  
lesse the chiefe place in Christs Church at that time.  
But in the prophet Aggeus by M. Dozman befoze al-  
leaged, whan Princes were godly, as well as Bishops  
(and therefore might haue a place in Goddes Church,  
as well as they) you shall finde that God by the pro-  
phet naminge together the godly Prince Zorobabell,  
and the godly high Priest Iesus, fise times ioinly, the  
Prince is set firste, and the high Priest after continu-  
ally. And there is a better vne of the degre of Princes  
and Priestes in Goddes Church whan thei were both  
godly and might both haue place there: than of suche  
times and places, as Princes were Heathen, & vnchrist-  
ened, and therefore could haue no place, much lesse the  
chiefe place in Christs Church, to seeke as doth M.  
Dozman a superiouritie for Priestes, as first placed, and  
of

of inferiouritie of Princes, as not at all placed. But we will not sticke with **D.** Dozman to giue the first place to godly Priestes aboute Chyristian Princes, touchinge the offices of preachinge, the power of the keyes, and of ministeringe the Sacramentes, appertaininge specialy to the Apostles, Prophetes, Doctors, &c. there first reckened we striue for no superiouritie to be giuen to Princes, in the exequuting of these thinges. But whan you come to the oversight that Ecclesiasticall ministers do their dueties, & to y<sup>e</sup> governinge of the Church touchinge the outwarde pollicie, & ordre Ecclesiasticall, what can you say against Chyristian Princes, as not the chiefe therein: Though they were not Chyristened at y<sup>e</sup> time, as **S.** Paule did write this, yet in the worde Gubernationes, governmentes, which is in **S.** Paules reherstal are the offices of god & godly Princes, commended vnto vs, as Caluine (whom you vntruely alleage as against vs in this place) doth also confesse. Now seinge all godly gouernours are there comended vnto vs (though Princes were than vngodly & Heathen) will you therefore reiect the aucthoritie of Chyristian princes, and gouernours, when God sendeth them, and leaue them no chiefe place in the governinge of Chyristes Church, for y<sup>e</sup> Heathen Princes had no place there: you might as reasonablie suffre Chyristian Princes to haue no place at all in Chyristes Church, for that heathen Princes had there no place at all. Belike you wil reiecte the gouernment of Emperours in the Romaine comon wealth, when they came in place, for that they had no rowme amongst the ould Romaine Kinges & Cōsulles. In your other place of y<sup>e</sup> Actes: the wordes to gouerne the flocke of Chyrist, are no more to say, but *Pascere gregem* to feede the flocke of Chyrist,

Caluine lib. 4.  
Instit. cap. 10.  
Sect. 4.

Act. 10.

**¶**

that

1. Petri. 5.

that is to say with the swede or bread of Goddes worde: in effect to teache them Goddes worde, which would to God your popishe Priestes woulde once beginne to do. S. Peter vseth the same worde, sayinge: feede yea the flocke of God, as much as in you lieth &c. and by and by he addeth: not as those that vse dominion over the flocke. Lo sir here is feedinge (whiche your Pope and popishe Prelates vse not) commaunded: here is vsing of dominion (whiche your Pope and popishe Prelates do vse) forbidden. And thus would you abuse the simple by the worde governe, which whan all cometh to al, is no more than to feede Christes flocke, that is to say, to teach them: which kinde of governinge being common to all godly & learned Bishops & Priestes, can nothingse serue for the prooufe of your proposition, of one Prieste to be head governour: & if by these wordes Regere Ecclesiā to governe the Church, *the whole gouernement, and chiefe souerentie be giuen, as you say, than haue the Bishoppes of Ephesus in Grace to whom those wordes were spokē, the whole regiment & chiefe soueraintie: and not your Pope. But that governinge of the Church whiche is in dede mente by this worde Regere, to rule, that is to say, to feede, by the preaching of Goddes worde, neither do Christian Princes enuie you, nor we, those heretiques you talke of, would haue from you: but do lament that your Pope and his Prelates, do forsake the ruling by preachinge, commaunded them by the Scriptures: and do take to them the rulinge by dominion, forbidden them by y<sup>e</sup> Scriptures. Not we therfore, but your Pope and his Prelates thus doinge, and you to your power mainteininge the same, are the perverters and corrupters of the true sense and meaninge of Goddes worde.*

And

Dorman supra  
fol. 19. b.

And y<sup>e</sup> godly Christian Princes may not by idle your Pope, & his Prelates vsurpinge rule & dominion, to the by the Scriptures forbidden: or may not correct the learning y<sup>e</sup> ruling by preachinge, by y<sup>e</sup> Scriptures commaunded them: or, if they will not be reformed, that Christian Princes may not provide for other that can, & will teach Goddes people, to the said Princes charge committed, according to the Scripture, what Scripture, or what one worde of Scripture can you show M. Dorman? Now to conclude concerninge the Scriptures: if it please the good Reader, to looke backe to M. Dorman's proposition (seeing him selfe wil not take the paines to do it) which he proponed in the beginning to be proved by this proccesse: that is, *That the head of the whole Church in earth must needs be a Priest. Thou shalt finde in al these Scriptures nothing at all therefore, but onely that, which showeth the office and duetic of all Priests equally, and therefore none to be as head above all the rest. And so finally all these Scriptures do nothing serue his purpose, but cleane ouerthrowe the same.*

*Dorman. Fol. 29.*

*As for the other point which Calvin also laieth to their charge, of accusinge of a most heynouse and grieuouse fault the auncient Bishoppes that haue bene sence the Apostles time, as though they had by vnlawfull meanes vsurped to them selues the office and dignitie of the Magistrate: it is also if their doctrine were true, most plain and euident euen at the eye. For firste if Kinges muste be the chiefe governours in matters of Religion, and Bishoppes their vnderlinges, who seeth not then, how far Ignatius that holy martyr abused bothe him selfe and vs. to bid all men without exception, euen the Emperour him selfe by name, to be obedient to the Bishop, to tell vs that after him next, the Kinge is to be honored.*

Ignatius.

Epistol. ad  
Philadelph.  
phen.

M 2

Nowell.

Norwell.

No remedie but Caluine must néedes still mainteine the matier with M. Dozman, against vs, by the doctors, as well as he did befoze, by the Scriptures.

First I haue declared that none of vs doth charge, or accuse the auncient Bishoppes, as though they in vsinge the power of bindinge and losinge (soz thereof speaketh Caluine) did vsurpe the office and dignittie of the Magistrate, soz we acknowledge it to be the office of Bishoppes and Churche, and not the office of the Magistrate: wherefoze they vsurpe not at all, in doinge their owne office. And so hath M. Dozman begonne his processe of doctours with a manifest vntruth. Ignatius speaketh of none other obedience to be by Princes, and all other, geuen to Bishoppes, but patiently to heare, credite, and folowe them truely teachinge Gods woorde, which was most necessarie in Ignatius time, whan Princes were Heathen men: and therefore could not haue place of honour befoze Bishoppes in Christs Church, where than they had no place at all. And in the respect of teachinge Goddes woorde truely, if greueth not Christian Princes, noz vs, that the Bishop as the teacher, be set befoze the Prince as the learner. Els if by Ignatius ordze, settinge Heathen Princes after Bishoppes, you would gather that absolutely the Bishop were aboue the godly Christian kinge: the ordze of the Scripture placing \* of kinges nexte to God, & placing of a godly Prince, befoze the chiefe Bishoppe in some one place fise times together, is of moze effect to proue the contrary.

Dorman Fol. 29.

If this be true, whiche they teache, who is he that can excuse.

Liberius.

\* Prouerb. 24.  
Time Dñm fili  
mi & Regem.  
1. Petri, 2. Deum  
timete, Regem  
honorificate.  
Aggæi. 1. Fa-  
ctū est verbum  
Dñi in manu  
Aggæi pphetæ  
ad Zorobabell,  
ducē Iuda & ad  
Iesum sacerdotē  
magnum. &c.  
And so fise  
times together  
in the same or-  
dre.

**Liberius.** *Liberius that holie father, who for the determining of matters concerning the Church, would have a Synode kept where the Emperour should not so muche as be present: Or that reuerend father Hosius, who willed the Emperour not to entremedle in ecclesiasticall causes, nor to comptroll or commaunde the bisshoppes therein, but to learne of them in those things, to whose charge they were committed, not to his.* Or **Athanasius** that strög pillar of Christs church, who when he sa we that wicked Emperour Constantius, doo that which the Heretikes of this our time, perswade the Kinges and Emperours that now are to doo, as the Arians did those of their age: that is to take vpo him the determination of matters Ecclesiasticall, to make him selfe chiefe iudge bothe of the Bisshoppes and causes belonginge to the Church, called him that abhominacion of desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet, and pronounced that for his so doinge his impietie was such, as Antichrist when he should come him selfe, should not be able to goe beyond: termed it a newe deuise brought in by the Arrians, and finally demaunded but one example ab æuo condito, from the beginning of the worlde: where by it might appeare that the doings of the Church should take their authoritie from the Emperour; till Arrius his time.

Translated out of Hosius. lib. 1. fol. 36. b. & 2. fol. 120.

No well.

These three, Liberius, Hosius Cordubensis, and Athanasius, do all speake of one matter and persone. Wherefoze one answer might serue for them all.

First concerning Libertus, he woulde not haue the wicked Arian, and violent Emperour Constantius, to be present at the councill, whiche maketh nothinge against the presence of godly Princes. For both Constantinus his father, a godly Prince, was present before him at the Nicene councill: and other godlie Emperours were after present at other councils, as is be-

\*  
Eusebius de vita Constantini li. 1. pag. 169.  
Socrates. lib. 7. cap. 8.  
Theodorit. li. 1. cap. 7. & 9.  
Sozom. lib. 3. cap. 19.

Am 3

foze.

foze declared, and is mosse evidently knowen to al lea-  
ned men, to be plainly recorded in the histories Eccle-  
siasticall. Not the example therofore of a wicked hære-  
tike, and Tyrant, shall serue to exclude godly Princes  
frō councels: but y<sup>e</sup> exāples of godly Princes present, shall  
serue for the presence of godly Christian Princes there.

Touching Hosius Cozdubensis, the like answere is  
to be made. He did will the same wicked Emperour not  
to intermedle in matters of Religion, who by intermed-  
ling therewith, would doe nothing els, but peruert them.

Sozom. li. 6. ca. 7

But all the godly Bishops of Hellesponte & Bithinia,  
sending bishop Hypattianus in a solemne embassage to  
the godly Emperour Valentinian the elder, prayed him  
that he would be present with them, to intreat of certē  
poinctes in Religion, to be reformed, (as M. Dozman  
hath befoze acknowledged) which declareth not a Prince  
absolutly, but suche a wicked haretique, & violent Ty-  
rant, as was Constantius, to be willed by Hosius, not  
to intermedle in Ecclesiastical causes. Athanasius that  
strong pillar of Christs Church, did call the same Co-  
stantius the abomination of desolatiō, and the foze rū-  
ner of Antichriste not for that he intermedled in causes  
Ecclesiastical, for than he shuld also haue called his fa-  
ther Constantinus, that godly Emperour, thabomina-  
tion of desolation, & as euell as Antichrist: for he did in-  
termedle as iudge in the causes Ecclesiastical betwēne  
Bishop Cæcilianus & Donatus: and betwēne Bishop  
Fœlix & the Donatistes, and in many like causes of bi-  
shops. But Athanasius had many other most weightie  
causes, why he shuld so call Constantius, which I haue  
at large befoze prosequuted. As, for that he tooke vpon  
him to be chiefe Bishop of all Bishoppes: that he would  
haue

Sup. fol. 22. a.

haue his will and pleasure to stande for Canons and Lawes : that he would not by reason and Scripture, but by threating and force compell all men to saye as he said, that he banished or murdered suche, as durst alleage Scripture, or reason against him: that he likewise banished or murdered innocent and godly Bishops, being onely complained vpon by suche as he fauoured, without triall of their cause, or knowledge of their answers : that he admitted mosse wicked and vile men, Eunuches, and suche lyke, to Bishoprikes, and placed them therein, with pompe and companie of men of warre: that no other commedation in the admitting of suche was looked for, but onely that they were enemies to Christ, and offered rounde summes of money : that he vilanously bled, tourmented, and murdered holic Virgins. For these causes, & specially, for that he did all these violences, and outrages, for the maintenauce of the Arriane heresie, whiche was directly against the persone of our Saviour Christe, did Athanasius worthely charge him with Antichristianisme, affirminge him to be that abomination of desolation, that Daniel speaketh of. To the whiche mosse horrible violences and outrages, and to the cause thereof, the Arrian heresie, seeing we neuer perswaded our Christian Princes, and they are in daede mosse farre from the said abominations, **D.** Dorman doth the to muche wrong, to lay Athanasius dispraifes of Constantius to our Christian Princes, being mosse vnlike vnto him in all deseruing thereof. As for vs, he may at his pleasure belie, when he list. If he list be occupied, he may iustly applie Athanasius his saynges of Constantius, to his Romishe Pope, in whome all these

vertues

vertues of Constantius are to be founde, with great increase of other abominations besides, prouing him to be the abomination of desolation, that Daniel speaketh of, and very Antichriste in deede: as I haue befoze at large declared. We persuaue our Christian Princes no other wise, neither doe they any other thinge, than did befoze them David, Solomon, Czechias, Josias, Constantinus, Valentinianus the elder, Theodosius, Marcianus, and other most godlie kinges and Emperours, as partly hath bene, and shal moze fullie be declared: in folowing of whom, they deserue like prasse with them, as like vnto them in vertues, and well doinges: and are therefore mosse vnworthely charged by M. Dozma with Antichristianisme and other dyspraises of Constantius, vnto whose impietie and wickednes, their pietie and godlines is mosse vnlke. Athanasius doth well terme Constantius his doing a nue deuille, and vpon good cause doeth demaunde but one example, from the beginning of the world, wherby it might appeare, that the iudgement of the Church (whiche M. Dozma termeth doinges of the Church) hath taken authoritie from the Emperour. For in deede it taketh authoritie from Gods woorde: and all good Princes are contented, that it so shall take: though Constantius, and such as he was, and the Popes also at this date, would haue it to take authoritie of their willes and pleasures: and you, and suhe as you are, doe most wickedly maynteine the same.

*Dorman. Fol. 30.*

*Or Gregorius Nazianzenus, who tolde the Emperour, that by Gregorius the lawe of Christe his power was subiect to his consistorie, and Nazianz that*

that although he were an Emperour, yet was he not withstanding  
shepe of his flock.

Nowell.

Gregorius Nazianzenus sayeth the verie truthe. There is no Prince so great, but he ought to obete suche a godly Bishop as was Nazianzene, pronouncing Gods woꝛde, and not to disdain to seade of the wholesome pastures of his true doctrine. Whiche yet letteth nothing but that a godly Prince, may both disobey a wicked Bishop, teachinge false doctrine, and saue his subiectes, from the leading vpo their poisoned pastures. And whereas Gregorius Nazianzenus beinge but a poꝛe Bishop in comparisson, & in an out side, doth claime the supertozitie ouer the Emperour, than the whiche the Bishop of Rome can claime no moze, it may appeare that Nazianzenus was æquall with him, in suche supertozitie.

Dorman. Fol. 30.

Ambrose. Or S. Ambrose, that had the Emperour set his hart at rest, and not to thinke that he had by the right of his crowne, any authoritie in those matters that concerned religion: that his palaice belonged to him, and the Church to the Priestes.

Out of Hosius  
lib. 2. fol. 119. b.

Nowell.

S. Ambrose saith to Valentinian the yonger, goinge about to do the same that Constantius befoze did, as did Athanasius befoze to Constantius: and therefore I say to S. Ambrose his woꝛdes here of Valentinean, as I befoze said of the like woꝛdes of Athanasius to Constantius. You do fondly compare the right whiche Valentinia claimed, to the right of godly Chꝛistia princes. For what right I pꝛaise you, could Valentinian the yonger, yet

Pr

ger, yet

ger, yet not christened, haue in Christs church:  
 When M. Dorman can proue that our Christian prin-  
 ces are bozne in hande, that all thinges are lafull for  
 them, & that thei haue imperial power, & authoritie ouer  
 Gods matters, as S. Ambrose testifieth, that Valentinian  
 was bozne in had: or that any prince doth so take  
 vpon them, as he did, that is to say, being vnchristened,  
 as he was, vnlearned & vnskillful, as he was, infected w<sup>th</sup>  
 the Arrian hærésie, as he was, w<sup>th</sup> either him self w<sup>th</sup>  
 out the aduise & assistance of any godly learned, iudge  
 of the highest poinctes of our faith, or apoint not onely  
 vnlearned Lay men, but Iues, or Infidels, to be Iudge  
 therein: let him than I say, say the like of our princes,  
 as said S. Ambrose of Valentinian the yonger, when  
 he can proue them like to Valentinian in those poinctes,  
 for the whiche S. Ambrose so said of him.

Ambros. Epist.  
 2. & 33.

Dorman. Folia. 30.

Translated word  
 for vwoorde, out  
 of Ho. li. 1. f. 39. b

Or Chrysostom, who comparing the power of a King, with the  
 autoritie of a priest, calleth the one a prince as wel as the other, and  
 greater then he toe, by so much as heauen is greater then the earth, &  
 addeth that God him selfe to witnesse the same, hath brought vnder  
 the handes of the priest the head of the Prince. For that saith he that  
 is lesser is blessed of the greater. Vvho in an other place saizeth that  
 the power which is geuen to priestes is such, as the like thereto was  
 neuer giuen to Angels or Archangels, seing that to none of them it  
 was euer said: What so euer you binde in earth shalbe bounde in  
 heauen, or what so euer you loose in earth shalbe loosed in heauen.

Chrysostom  
 Homi. 5. l.  
 verbis Esai.  
 Heb. 7.  
 Lib. 3. De  
 sacerdotio.

NeWell.

Dor. sup. fo. 21. a.  
 Ex Homel. 38.  
 in Math. 21.

The sentence of Chrysostome befoze alleaged by M.  
 Dorman, that priests are the hart and stomack of the church, which

50

he than liked so well, & he said therupon, *Lo good Readers,* you see how it was in *Chrysostomes time* &c. hath here, I wot not why, so mistaked him that he hath in this reherfall conclusion made no mention thereof: peradventure his proposition of one head priest came here into his heart or mind, & he considering the vnhandsomnes of the reason, to proue one priest to be head, by *Chrysostomes* saying, that priests were the heart & stonacke (which par-die, ye wot is not the head) he let it go, as not liking his stomack in this place. But he hath lost nothing thereby, for in tossing of *Hesius* his authours booke, and finding for this one place, to w or thre other of *Chryso-stome* there noted, he liking them better thā the other, hath here sticked downe, not for a goose, a fether, but thre geese, for one: which I say, in respect of his abusing of *Chrysostomes* places.

And very true it is, & some princes in *Chrysostomes* time taking to much vpon them, & being to extreme against him, & such godly bishops as he was, he did go about by depressing of princes, and extolling of priestes, as much as he could, to bring the princes of his time to a moderatton. And we neuer denied but that in doinge their office, according to Gods word, as in binding and loosing, which part of their office is specially, & by name by *D. Dormā* out of *Chrysostome* here noted, the godly priestes be aboue princes: & that princes ought to obey them, so doing their office, as did *Theodosius* & *Emperour* obey *S. Ambrose*, worthely excommunicating him.

Neither wil I be against *Chrysostome*, but the priest in this point hath a power geue him, which not onely kinges, but Angels also haue not geuen to them. But will *D. Dormā* thereof conclude that the Prieste is

Hos<sup>s</sup> li. 1. f. 39. a  
Chryso<sup>st</sup>. li. 3.  
De sacerdotio &  
de verbis Esaiæ  
Homil. 4.

A REPROVVE OF M.

the head of Angelles too, and not onely of Princes: In  
 dede he may. For it is said y<sup>e</sup> Angels geve attendaunce  
 vpon the Popes highnes, to carie and recarie soules to  
 and fro Purgatozle.

Dorman. Fol. 30.

Out of Ho. li. 1.  
 fol. 37.

Or howe were it possible if this doctrine of our aduersaries  
 were true, to excuse Damascenus for reprehending Leo Isaurus (as  
 you haue hard before) the Emperour, and many a one more of the holy  
 fathers, which for breuities sake I am here constrained to passe ouer  
 in silence.

Damascen

Nowell.

Damascen<sup>o</sup>. Nō  
 recipio Regem  
 qui per tyranni-  
 dem sibi sacerdo-  
 tium vsurpat.

Damascene may be wel excused for reprehending  
 Leo Isaurus the Emperour for vsurpinge and takinge  
 Priesthood vpon him by tyranny: as Damascene wit-  
 nesseth, and you M. Dorman haue alleaged.

But M. Dorman can not be so wel excused for sayng  
 Damascenes saynges against a tyzant, and vsurper of  
 priesthōde (if Damascene say true) against godly prin-  
 ces, nether tyzantes, nor vsurpers of priesthōod. And he  
 doth also moſte vntruely charge our doctrine, as main-  
 taining either such tyzanny, or ſuche vsurpation.

That you for breuities sake are constrained to passe  
 ouer in ſilēce many an one of the holy fathers, making  
 with you against vs, can no wyse man beleaue, whoe  
 reading your proceſſe befoze, ſhal finde that of great pe-  
 nurſe, & ſcar ſittle of holy fathers, you were inforced to  
 alleage for you the doinges and ſayngs of vnholly Hæ-  
 retiques, Apoſtatas, Tyzantes, and Paganes, and  
 ther cuppon, as vpon good euidence, to make no ſim-  
 ple byagge.

Dor ſup fol. 23.  
 34.  
 Theodoricus.  
 Iulianus.  
 Gallio.  
 Aurelianus.

Nowe

Nowe as of the Scriptures, so likewise of these doctours by M. Doorman here alleaged, I praise the good Reader, consider whether there be any one that may prove his proposition, *That the head of Christes Church here in earth must needs be a Priest.* For doo not all these places of the Scriptures and Doctours, declare the office and authoritie of every Bishop and Priest indifferently, & therefore derogate from the chiefe authoritie of one head Priest ouer all: Further these Scriptures and doctours by M. Doorman alleaged prove nothing elles, but that which is, and euer was graunted, and therefore did néede no proufe, that is to say: that Bishops and Priests haue to doe in matiers Ecclesiasticall, that Princes ought reuerently to heare, credite, & obey them, doinge their office according to Goddes worde: that is, preachinge the worde of God, vsinge the power of the keies, and ministering the Sacramentes, syncerely according to the same. Whiche reuerent obedience is showed in déede to Goddes worde, rather than to them: against the whiche worde of God, in case the saide Bishoppes doe notoziouly offende, or in doinge their office swarue fró the same, the Christian Prince may with the god aduise of the godly learned, specially of the Cleargie, by example of all godly auncient Princes, admonish them, punishe them, or depose, and depriue them: whiche argueth in the said Prince a superiouritie ouer them. Further whereas to summon and call Bishoppes and the Cleargie to Synodes or Councelles, in cases requisite, to moderate and gouerne them assembled, to vnderstande, approue, and authorize thinges in suche Synodes or Councelles agreed vpon: to receiue appeales, assigne delegates, for the hearing, and determininge of contro-

verſes betwaine Biſhops, and others of the Cleargie, & in cauſes Eccleſiaſticall, are pointes of ſuperioritie ouer the ſaide Biſhoppes and Cleargie, and of chiefe gouernment in the ſaid cauſes Eccleſiaſticall, & doe apperteyne to Chriſtian Princes, as hath been partly alreadie & ſhal hereafter be moze fully and clearly declared: it ſoloweth neceſſarily, y<sup>e</sup> Chriſtian Princes are chiefe gouerners ouer ſuch perſons, & in ſuch cauſes Eccleſiaſticall. Againſt the whiche, ſeinge M. Dorman in this firſt parte wherein he promiſed to bring into the face of open court all ſuch euidence of importance, as his parte hath to alleage for them ſelues, (ſoz theſe are his wordes) hath brought nothing, that is of any importaunce, or to any purpoſe at all, he hath thereby in the face of open court confeſſed, that he had nothing of any importaunce at all to bring. And ſo conſequentially hath he neither proued his propoſition, that the head of Chriſtes Church here in earth muſt needes be a Biſhop: neither by any iuſt conſequence thereof, that a Chriſtian Prince is not the chiefe gouernour in cauſes, & ouer perſons Eccleſiaſticall within his owne dominions.

Dorman ſupra  
fol. 17. b.

Dorman. Fol. 30.

Leauinge therefore our aduerſaries thus at ſquare, bothe with the olde Fathers and their newe doctours: it is high time good readers that I remembre to diſcharge my ſelfe of my promiſe, whiche was to laie before your eyes, ſuch euidence as in this matter either part had to bringe for the ſelfe. Vvhich as I haue for the catholikes accordinge to my ſimple wite and poore knowledge alreadie done. ſo ſhall I by Goddes grace on the contrary parte for the proteſtantes and Huguenates, faithfully endenour to doo the like. And becauſe, for that aſwell of all the poiſoned reaſons touching either this mat-

ter, or

ter, or almost any other at this day in question, the late Apologie of the Church of England (for so is it by the authours termed) may well be called as it were the some or abridgement, as also for that there is as it should seeme and sence hath been confessed, in it comon consent of all the fantastickall congregation, I meane of them that trouble Christes Church in our countrie of Englande: I could not me thought either for their parte (which I couet to make as stroge as the naughtines of the cause will suffer (doo better, or for mine owne assurance worcke more warily, then to take and cull out suche proufes, as for the maintenaunce of their opinio they haue there heaped to gether. For them, because there I perswade my selfe the reader may finde, the very force and strength of all that they haue for them selues in this matter to saie: as the place where bothe of good reason they shoulde, and for their craftie conueyance I nothinge doubt but they woulde, bringe foorth of their groundes the very beste, if they haue any better then other. For my parte or rather for Christe and his Churches whose quarell although farre vnwoorthy, at this time I susteine, it shall thus stande in steede, that if it fortune in your iudgementes good Readers their said groundes and reasons to seeme suche, as any good man, yea happily with some of them, some of them selues may mislike: they can not yeat flee to their olde startinge hole that it is but one doctours minde, as they vse being sore pressed customably to doo, whereas the booke bothe by the manner of the publishinge thereof appeareth, and sence hath bene acknowledged, to be no priuate mans acte.

No Well.

That we be at square either with y<sup>e</sup>ould fathers, or our nue doctozs, hath appeared euidently to be but M. Dormans dreame, voide of all reason and truth. It is prasse wortie in M. Dozman y<sup>e</sup> he remembzeth his promesse, whiche you shall see him go through with all in his  
 second

Huguenotes.

seconde parte, with like witte, knowledge, faith, and  
 grace, as he hath in the first part alreadie perfozmed it.  
 He doth well also seeing he hath once begonne to speake  
 Frenche, to continue in Frenche termes of reproche,  
 least he might seeme to haue vttered all his Frenche at  
 once. But now it pleaseth M. Dozman to respite the  
 Bishoppe of Sarisburie his Sermon, and to set vpo the  
 Apologie: which he gathereth by probable coniecture. (as  
 he thinketh) and by confession also (as he saith) to be no  
 one mans acte, but the common deuise of all the phan-  
 tasticall congregation (as it pleaseth him to terme vs)  
 out of the whiche Apologie he will cull (foz so he spea-  
 keth) our reasons and proufes: and that vppon a mani-  
 folde consideration, and caution. *As, first to make our parte  
 as stronge as he can: Scilicet. Secondly, warely for his owne as-  
 surance: And thirde, lest when he shall sore presse vs, we should  
 flee to our customarie sertiuge hole, that it is but one doctors minde:*  
 and that so he will confute, not onely the Bishoppe of  
 Sarisburie his sermon, but the Apologie also: and with  
 it all the aduersaries of the papacie at once, *as one though  
 farre vnrwoorthie, susteinynge at this time the quarell of the Ro-  
 mishe Church.* This the mans manifolde circumspection  
 and discretion here in the beginning notified, as he cu-  
 stomarily vseth in the pzoesse you shall see it fall out,  
 accordinge to that experience, whiche you haue had of  
 the same heretofore. But in dedde M. Dozman hath not  
 foz the causes by him here alleaged, answered these al-  
 legations in the Apologie. Foz the Apologie doth onely  
 goe about by sondry examles bziessly touched to pzoue  
 that godly Princes of all ages did thinke, that the care  
 of the Church was not impertinent to their office. The  
 very woordes of the Apologie are these: Ex historijs &  
 optimo-

optimorum temporū exemplis videmus pios principes procuracionem Ecclesiarū ab officio suo nunq̄ putasse alienam. That is to say: we do see by histories & examples of the best ages or times, ȳ godly Princes did thinke that the looking to, & care of Churches, was neuer impertinent to their princely office. This he saith before his p̄oues. And in ȳ conclusiō after his p̄oues, he saith againe. An ad eos dicimus religionis curam non pertinere? &c. that is to say: Shall we say therfore that the care of Religion doth not appertaine to godly Princes, or that a Christian Magistrate intermedlinge in these things, doth naughtly, immodestly, or wickedly? These are the wordes of the Apologie, than the which, what can be more modestly, or more truely spoken: And that nothing in so great breuitie, can be more effectuously p̄oued, than is the said most true proposition (euer denied by the Papistes) p̄oued by those examples and histories Ecclesiasticall so shortly in the Apologie touched, they may wel vnderstand, that will reade that parte of it. Wherefore seinge the Apologie in that treatie doth not so much inforce ȳ superiortie of Princes ouer Priestes, but is contented to p̄oue, and doth p̄oue, though briefly, yet most substantially, that the care of Religion doth appertaine to Christian Princes, whiche these men do denie: it is not therfore to make our partie as strong, as may be (as M. Dozman professeth he would) but to make it as weake as may be, and more weake, than reason would it should be, to bring in examples, by ȳ Apologie briefly alleaged, or rather touched, onely for p̄ouise, ȳ care of Religion & Church matters doth appertaine to godly & Christian princes, as though they had bene alleaged peculiarly, largely, and with al

force, to proue al the authoritie y<sup>e</sup> Princes haue in matiers of Religion, & their whole superiortie y<sup>e</sup> thei haue ouer Priests. Whereas M. Dozman, & all our aduersaries doe right well know, & in this litle treatie it shall also wel appeare, that both we haue great store of other examples & proues for our Christian Princes chiefe gouernement ouer Priests, & in matiers Ecclesiastical, & y<sup>e</sup> the examples also by the Apologie, though but briefly, & to a certaine purpose touched, & in the onely tow litle leaues contained, may be moze fully, & with moze force and effect applied to the proues of godly Princes prerogatiue about Priests, & authoritie in Ecclesiastical matiers, than in y<sup>e</sup> breuitie the author of y<sup>e</sup> Apologie either could, or ment to doe. Not to strengthen our cause, therfore, but most to weaken it, hath M. Dozma dreamed out this deuise of dealinge with the Apologie in this place. And for that he did see those so many examples so briefly touched in the Apologie in tow or thre leaues onely, he surmiseth, and would beare the Reader in hand, that there is all, that we all can say, & as largely and effectually, as by vs all can be said for the authoritie of Princes ouer Priests, & in matiers Ecclesiastical. But in deede, M. Dozman thought y<sup>e</sup> breuitie, in the touching of this matter (which was necessarie in the Apologie touching so many maters) to be moste fitte for his purposed quarrelling: and specially he findinge that Hosius in his booke of Ecclesiasticall Judges had laboured at large to answer all those examples of the ould Judges and Kinges of Israell, Josuas, Dauid, Salomon, Ezechias, Josophat, Josias, and likewise of the ould Christian Emperours, Constantinus, Theodosius, Valentinianus, and Martianus, alleaged of our part for the authoritie

De Iudicibus ecclesiasticis lib. 2.  
contra Brentiu.  
fol. 66. b.  
Hosius fol. 75.

title of Princes ouer persons & in causes Ecclesiasticall,  
 thought it the beste to folowe his old vsuall custome,  
 and his easiell ordinarie way, & to translate the whole  
 treatie of those examples out of Hosius into his booke.  
 After whiche sorte, a meane clarke may write, like not  
 onely a base Bachelor, but also a profounde doctour in  
 diuinitie, and like a great Cardinall of Rome also.  
 What colours therfore so euer M. Dozman doeth pre-  
 tend, the very causes of his, thus dealinge with the A-  
 pologie are these: falsely to beare the reader in hande,  
 that he dealeth with vs all, and that he oppugneth all  
 our chiefe firmamentes at once, and to take his owne  
 ease, and yet neuerthelesse being but a balde colwete, to  
 bragge of that proude peacockes feathers. And now for  
 these twentie leaues next folowinge in this M. Doz-  
 mans treatie, all his answers are the same that be in  
 M. Hardinges booke intituled a *Confutation of the Apologie*  
*of the Church of Englande*, and the same are to be founde in  
 Cardinall Hosius seconde booke of the iudges of the  
 Church, where they both borowed them. May I not  
 therfore truely without lie, & soberly without bragge  
 say, that in answeringe M. Dozman, I do answere  
 his Maister M. Hardinge, and Cardinall Hosius, with  
 all other our aduersaries, countremen, or strangers, that  
 haue the same reasons, and allegations:

Hosius lib. 2. de  
 iudicibus Eccle-  
 siasticis.

Dorman Fol. 31.

The first  
 argument  
 of the pro-  
 testantes.  
 Hoyses.

*The first argument therefore of theirs, to proue that lay men in  
 that they be kinges may take on them the ordering of matters in re-  
 lligion, that to them belongeth the auctoritie and oversight thereof,  
 is taken from the example of Moyses, who being a ciuile magistrate,*

Do 2

received

received neuerthelesse at the handes of almighty God, both the charge and ordie of all the religion and ceremonies, deliuered the same to the people, and when Aarō beinge a Bisshop had contaminat the true Religion by makinge the golden calfe, he failed not sharply to rebuke and reprehende him therefore.

The effect of all this answere they frame, that therefore by good consequence it foloweth that the Kinges, Emperours, and other ciuile magistrates of our time may doe the like, thus doe we answere: that, that auctoritie which Moyses had ouer the Priestes, was not because he was a Prince but in that he was a Priest, as appeareth moste evidently in the Psalmes where he is so called.

The answere. Psalm. 94. Nowell. It is Psalm.

Cōfut. Apolog. fol. 305. Psalm, 98.

Cohen, id est sacerdos vel dux, vel princeps, vel consiliarius &c.

The very same answere maketh D. Harding to this place of the Apologie. But you do not say truely D. Dozman that it appeareth most evidently in the Psalmes where Moses is called a Priest, that the auctoritie, which he had ouer the Priestes, was not because he was a Prince, but in that he was a Priest. For firste of a worde of doubtfull signification, as is Cohen, in that Psalmes, you can not make moste euident appea-  
raunce, that Moses was a Priest. Secondly it beinge graunted you that in the Psalmes he is called a Priest: yet can you not thereof make it likely, muchlesse moste euidently to appeare, that he had his auctoritie ouer Aaron the high Priest, with others, to reprove and correct them, not because he was a Prince, but in that he was a Priest. For if I should say the contrary, that Moses had that auctoritie in that he was a Prince, what can you say out of the Psalmes, or any other place of Scripture againste me? Aaron offending, saith to Moses being displeas'd with him therefore.

Ne

Ne indignetur Dominus meus. Let not my Lord be angry. If I say, he called and acknowledged Moses his Lord, because he was his Prince, not because he was a Priest, for that this name Lord so properlie signifieth and importeth, what will you say against it: or howe can it reasonable be, that there was a priest above the highest priest, as Aaron was: But it is no absurditie, that a Prince be above the highest priest: but the title and name, of highest priest (as was Aaron) excludeth all superfluous of all priestes ouer him: but not of all Princes. Wherefore, I may rather say, that Aaron calling Moses his Lord, and so confessing him superior, so called and confessed him, as his Prince, and not as his higher priest: for he was y<sup>e</sup> highest priest him self.

Dorman. Fol. 31.

ae Reply.

But against this answer laboureth (as they say) with tooke and naile, the author of that booke which walketh abroad in many mens handes, vnder the name of a harbrough for faithfull subiectes. Whose replie is this, that in that psalme how euer the olde interpreters haue giuen vs the woord, the hebrue text hath Cohanim, a worde indifferent to signifie priestes or Princes, and that therefore suche as doe best vnderstande the tongue giue it thus: Moyses & Aaron inter ministros eius, Moyses and Aaron amongst his ministres. And to proue that it may wel so be, the scripture he saith calleth David his sonnes Cahanim, that is to saie ministres, for well he woteh that no man wilbe so fond to saie, that a kinges sonnes were priestes: yea he addeth that the beste amongst the Hebrues interpreting thiese wordes giue it in Chorei Shemo: Moyses & Aaron inter eos qui inuocant nomen eius, Moyses and Aaron amongst them that call vpon his name. Thiese in effect be the reasons that moued the man to thinke that Moyses was no priest.

A REPROVVE OF M.

To be short. VVhome he taketh for the best, or whom he accōp- The folu  
 teth for the worst in the hebrue tōge, or what his habilitie to indge prouig it  
 thereof is, I confesse in good faith I knowe not. But of this I am wel Moysear  
 assured, that S. Hierome, Pagninus and (whose translation for his re- a priest.  
 ligion he neede not to suspect, Sebastianus Munsterus, emongest alme  
 taken for singulerly learned in that tongue) interpret the worde to  
 signifie priestes. And if all this satisfie him not, the 70. interpretours  
 translate it so. For thiese are their wordes: Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἀαρὼν  
 ἐν τοῖς ἱερεῶσιν αὐτῶν. that is, Moyses and Aaron in the nōbre of  
 his priestes. And for so vndoubted a truehe was it taken with S.  
 Hierom, that he in the exposition of this Psalm vsed thiese wordes.  
 Vterq; Moyses scilicet & Aaron, domini aduentum sacerdo- Hieron.  
 tali præconio nunciauit. Both of them, that is to sey Moyses and Psalm. 91  
 Aaron, did with their priestly voyce denounce before hande, the com-  
 ming of our Lorde. Nor we touching the indifferency of the worde  
 Cohanim to signifie a minister or a priest, we graunt it to be true:  
 but that because in some one place it so signifieth, it ought therefore  
 so to be expounded in this, that we vtterly denie. And for prooffe  
 hereof we bring Abrahamus Esdras, emongest the olde Rabbini cal-  
 led Sapientissimus. He expounding this place of the psalme, calleth  
 Moyses and Aaron by the name of priestes. And because no man shuld  
 cauill about the ambiguitie of the worde Cohanim, he graunteth  
 it to be a worde doubtful. But to take away all such ambiguitie, and  
 to make vs assuredly vnderstand when it signifieth this or that, he  
 giueth this rule, that being ioined and applied to the name of god,  
 or any thing to him belonging (as here it is) it signifieth alwaies a  
 priest; but other wise referred to prophane thinges, a minister: as may  
 be answered of Dauids children in the second booke of kinges the 8.  
 chapter. And surely so long as he standeth vpon his bare vauntes of  
 the best without naming at all any: I see no cause but that we may  
 well rest in that interpretatiō which thiese former, for their know-  
 ledge in that tongue of the learned sort accounted most excellent,  
 beside

Beside the nombre of the 70. interpreters haue deliuered vnto vs, especially seeing that interpretation which the very best amongst the Hebrues he saith haue geuen vpon that place, that is, Moyses and Aaron amongst them that call vpon his name: I thinke to him that considereth wel the wordes that followe. Et Samuel inter eos qui inuocāt nomen eius, will seeme and proue to be euen the very worst. But because you shall well perceiue that Moyses was in deede a priest, besides the testimonies already brought furth, I shall here alleage certein other to proue the same.

psalm. 98.

First, Austin writing vpon the same psalme where both he and Aaron are called priestes, maketh as it were against the priesthood of Moyses a certein obiection, and after ward cōcludeth that Moyses was not withstanding a priest. His wordes are these: Ibi quidē non videtur sacerdos esse nisi Aaron. Apertē enim in illis literis Aaron nominatur sacerdos dei. De Moysē non ibi dicitur quod sacerdos erat, Sed si hoc non erat, quid erat? Nunquid maior sacerdote esse poterat: Expropriat psalmus iste quia & ipse sacerdos erat: Moyses & Aaron in sacerdotibus eius. Ergo erāt illi domini sacerdotes. that is to say, there it semeth that there was no other priest but Aaron: for in that place is he plainly named a priest, but of Moyses there is no suche word. But if he were not a priest, what was he then? Could he be greater? The psalme vttereth that he was a priest: Moyses and Aaron amongst his priestes. They were therefore both our Lordes priestes.

D. Hard, Cōfū.  
Apolog. fol. 305.  
hath the same.

rod. 28.

Here I beseeche you good readers, behold the false and vneuen dealing of an heretike, the author of the harborough, of whom a litle before I made mention. He minding to elude this manifest exposition of S. Austen, answereth in this manner: that S. Austen was ignorant in the Hebrue tongue, whereby being easely deceiued and wrapped in these two places of Scripture, wherein there seemed contradiction, he leaueth them at a iarre as he founde them, the one to saie he was a prieste, the other to saie that he was none. Vvhich māner of interpretatiō and recōciling of scriptures how it is to be liked.

liked, he leaueth he saith to the learned reader to iudge.

For answer to this mere cauillation of this vaine tangle before I procede any farther, because he shall not abuse s. Austens ignorance in the Hebrue tongue to the deceauing of you good readers, you shall vnderstande that s. Hierom was not ignorant therein, and yet doeth he so expounde the place. The. 70. interpretoours chosen and picked as it were out of the best learned and cunningest in that tongue (by all likelihood) that could be founde: sanctes Pagninus and Sebastianus Munster, yea that most learned Rabbine, Abrahamus Esdras a Iewe born, wer not ignorant but pearlesse Paragös therein, and yet doe all thiese expounde the Hebrue word to signifie priestes as saint Austen doeth. And where he saith that s. Austen beinge thus wrapped in thiese two contrarie textes, was driuen to leaue them as he founde them, the one to saie he was a priest, thother that he was none: in the one he hath belied the holie scriptures, in the other he hath sclandered that holie and learned Bishop. For where, or what scripture saith, that Moyses was no priest (as he saith that one texte saide he was, an other that he was none?) Let him shewe somme such scripture, or els hath he lied vpon the scripture. He may shewe I confesse where the scripture (as there vpon s. Austen made his obiection) speaking of him, calleth him not by name of a Priest: which in many other places it doth also of Aaron. Is this therefore a good reason to saie? The scripture in that place made no mention that he was a priest: therefore it saith that he was none. Yea true-ly, euen as good as is this. The scripture maketh no mention that the Apostles were euer baptised: therefore it saith that thei neuer were baptised. Or doe these textes make any iarre, the one affirming the the other denieng, to saie Aaron the priest in one place, and Moyses or Aaron his priestes in an other? But as this is a lewd lie, so to goe about to note s. Austen to the world of suche ignorance in the scriptures, as though he had not byn able to vndoe this simple knot (a knot if it be) but was forced to leaue the two places at a iarre vnrecon-  
ciled.

ciled: I can call it no better but even by the name of wilful malice. As appeareth by that, that guilefully in alleaying after their manner without coraſion, (the caſtelier thereby to deceaſe the reader) this place of S. Auſten: he left out theſe later wordes, Ergo erant illi domini ſacerdotes, therefore they were (Moyſes, and Aaron) our Lordes prieſtes.

Exod. 28.

Now here note I beſeche you diligently that are of the learned ſorte, theſe wordes of S. Auſten, whiche import in them thus much. It may ſeeme ſaith he, to ſome man, that Moyſes (becauſe the ſcripture nameth there onely Aaron by the name of a prieſt and not him) were no prieſt: but of them that ſo gather I would knowe, if he were no prieſt what he was then, whether they can make him King, Emperour, or any thing that ſhould be greater. And although the ſcripture in that place doe not call him by the name of his office, yet neither doeth it therefore deny him to be prieſt, nor we are deſtitute of other places to proue the ſame by, as namelic this pſalme, wherein expreſſelie he is ſo called. Vvherfore ſeing neither that place or any other, doe ſaie that he was not a prieſt, and there is plaine ſcripture that doeth call him one: I maie boldelie conclude, Erant ergo illi ſacerdotes domini. Therefore they were both our lordes prieſtes.

This is (no doubt) the true ſenſe of S. Auſtens wordes, whereby you may ſee howe greate the difficulties were, in whiche he was wrapped, and how he wounde him ſelfe out.

Nowell.

You ſee how ſharply M. Dorman interteineth the authour of the barbozough, reprehending him for affirming that Moſes was no prieſt, and for not allowyng of S. Auguſtines expoſition vpon the. 98. Pſalme teaching that Moſes was a prieſt: and for his interpreting of this Hebrue woorde (Cohanim) in the ſaied Pſalme Miniſtros non ſacerdotes, Miniſters not prieſtes,

Priests, otherwise than S. Austen taketh it: and for that the saide authour affirmeth that S. Augustine was not learned in the Hebrue tongue. In the handling of all whiche matters, M. Dozman sheweth him selfe to be a great Hebrician, and familiarly conuersant in the ould Rabins. I neede not here to stand in the defense of the authour of the barbarough against M. Dozman, for that the said authour (if he list) can well enough him selfe shifte with M. Dozman, or any other his aduersaries. And the lesse cause haue I to travell against M. Dozman in this his so long a discourse, for it is not so muche materiall, whether Moses be taken for a Priest or for no Priest, as shall hereafter appeare. And though I can professe no knowledge in y<sup>e</sup> Hebrue tongue: yet I may be bould to say thus muche, that although Moses, vntill he had instituted Aaron highe Priest, did by Gods comaundemēt the office of the high priest, sacrificing, anointing & ordering of Aaron & his children: yet afterward it appeareth not that he offered any sacrifice, which is the peculiar office of the Priest, but left it to Aaron and his successours, as M. Dozman out of Calaine hereafter allegeth: bowbeit, after he had instituted Aarō highe Priest, he reproved and corrected Aaron, and directed him in his doings: not by the authoritie of the highe Priesthoode, whiche now Aarō had, but by the authoritie of his Lordshipp: and Princedom. And where as Moses in the. 98. Psalm is termed a Priest with Aaron, that is to be referred to that speciall time, wherein Moses bled the priesthood before, and at the institution of Aaron. Els, if you doe vnderstand that he was called afterward by this name Cohen, id est Sacerdos, a Priest. Sacerdos is there as  
 muche

Exod. 28.

Exod. 32.  
Leuit. 10.

muche to saie as Cultor Domini, timensq; illum, & Priest, that is to say, a worshipper of the Lorde, & one that feareth him: as Sanctes Vagninus, a man well learned in the Hæbrue tongue, & not to be suspected as partial of our side, bpõ y. no. Psalme, & the. i. Paral. 18. & in other places doth out of K. Dauid Kimhi doeth interpretate it: Cohen, inquit, id est, Sacerdõs, ac si dicat tu es colens Dominum, & dux Israel &c. and againe, Cohanim sacerdotes, id est, cultores Domini, timen-tesq; illum: Cohen & Cohanim, a Priest or Priestes, that is to say, the worshipper of God, & the duke of Israel, & one y feareth God. Such a maner of Priest, y is to say, one that feared & worshipped God, one y was of counsel with God, & a prophet of God, we wil not denie but that Moses was cuẽ in the highest degre. And we trust that no reasonable man wil denie y a godly Christian Prince may be called Cohen a Priest, in y sense, that is, one y feareth God, worshippeth & serueth God: specially seing the Scripture termeth al y truely godly, a kingly priesthood. D. Hardig surely sticketh not to say that a Christiã Prince in baptisme receiueth a spiritual priesthood: & so he may be called Cohen, id est Sacerdos a priest: but yet is he not properly a priest in office. For that Moses was a priest properly after y he once had instituted Aaron, doeth it appeare by any sacrifice y he did offre, which was y prope office of the priest, & was executed by Aaron: besides the absurditie of to w highe Priestes at once, whiche should folowe in case Moses were highe Priest tw, and aboue Aaron also. Whereof more is to be said hereafter. But as K. Dauid Kimhi by Vagninus his interpretation expoundeth a Prieste, and also so, that Moses was of the Tribe or Kase of Leuite, to y which the priesthood was by God peculiarly

1. Petr. 2.

D. Hard. Cõfut.

Apolo. fol 319. a.

Exod. 29.

Leuit. 8.

Obtulit Moses

sacrificium.

assigned, he might therefore haue the name of a priest, though he had not the proper office of a priest, after the institution of Aaron. But nowe that *M. Dozman* hath bestowed so much labour to proue *Moses* a priest, and yet hath not made it as he said most evidently to appeare, that he was a priest in deede, though he somewhere haue the name of *Cohen*, or *Sacerdos*: if it should be graunted him for certen, that *Moses* was a priest, yet hath he sayd nothing to the principall point, to make it appeare any thing evidently, muche lesse most evidently, that he had his authoritie ouer *Aaron* being the high priest, to repproue and correcte him by his Priesthood, and not by his Princedom. For surely this is no good reason, *Moses* was both Priest and Prince, therefore he had al his authoritie ouer the high Priest by his Priesthood, and not by his Princedom. And I trust I haue partly made the contrary eident, and will yet make it more eident, by declaringe of the authoritie of sondrie Princes, noe Priestes, ouer Bishoppes and Priestes.

*Dorman. Fol. 34.*

But then saith this stoute Champion, there were two high Priestes at once, which could not be by the Lawe, and also *Moses* must nedes be inferior to *Aaron*, because *Aaron* and not he, is there called the high priest.

This obiection hath in dede a shewe of somewhat, although in their manner of gouernement, to haue manie heades were no great absurditie at all. But to this obiection answereth most fully *S. Austen*, him self in an other place, after this sort. *Cum ergo videatur, &c.* Seinge therefore that the high priesthood, seemeth to haue be-  
gonne in *Aaron*, what thinke we that *Moses* was? if he were

In quest  
Sup. Let  
Lib. 3. ca

not

not a Priest, how did he then all those things which he did? If he were, how say we that the high priesthood beganne in his brother Aaron? Although the Psalmie also where it is saide, Moses and Aaron amongst his Priests, doeth remove all cause of doubt, affirming that Moses was also a Priest. Were they therefore Moses and Aaron, bothe chiefe Priests, or rather Moses the chiefe and Aaron under him? yea Aaron also the chiefest in respect of the Bishoppes appavel, and Moses the chiefe in respect of a more excellent ministry. For at the beginninge was it saide to Moses of Aaron. He shall be thy director in those things that are to be handled with the people, and thou his, in such busines as is to be done with God.

Nowell.

It appeareth that this objection of towo high Priestesses at once threudly encombzeth you M. Dorman, whā you are dziven to say, that in their maner of governmēt to have many heades, were no great absurditie at all. Why M. Dormā, if it were no great absurditie: it seemeth you graunt it some absurditie, which to graunt in Goddes ordinance, is the greatest absurditie of all. And where you say no great absurditie at all, it appeareth you will not what you said at all: for if it be no absurditie at all (as being Gods ordinance, touching Moses and Aaron, it must needs be) than is it neither great nor small. What meaneth therefore your no great absurditie at all: and whiche is that, their maner of government you speake of? You goe aboute to shew it out of S. Augustine, but you labour in vaine: for it was with him no such absurditie to graunt towo high Priestesses or head Bishoppes in the Church, as it is with you: who will needs have but one onely head Bishoppe. In S. Augustines time all Bishops were high Priestesses, that is, every one in their owne diocesse: and

By Goddes lawe all Bishoppes are æquall in authoritie, and therefore no one aboue all, as you say your Pope is. Wherefore both the æqualitie of Bishoppes, as euery one highest in his owne diocesse by Goddes lawe, and your grauntinge of tow highe Priestes at once, (as you here do) and of the tow, Poles to be superiour to Aaron, who is the figure of your high Priest the Pope, do make both against one onely high Priest, and against the supremacie of that one. But it is worthy the reading that he alleageth out of S. Augustine: Aaron the chiefe in respecte of the Bishoppes. apparell and Moses the chiefe in respect of a more excellent ministerie, &c. these wordes of S. Augustine for that M. Dozman supposed them to be darke, he doeth illustrate with a marginnall glose thus: *By the Bishoppes apparell vnderstande the execution of the thinges belonging thereto: this is M. Dozmanns glose.* And who is he now that will not thinke him selfe well and clearely resolved of that doubtfull somewhat whiche M. Dozman confesseth to be in this objection of tow high Priestes at once, and al matters to be put of doubt: seing M. Dozman saith, that in their maner of gouernement, and in diuers respectes is no great absurditie at all, to haue tow high Priestes and many heades. And y<sup>e</sup> respect whereby Aaron is the chiefe Priest, is the respect of the Bishoppes apparell, whereby ye must vnderstand the execution of the thinges belonging thereto: and in the same respect is the Pope by Aarons example, the chiefe Priest to, belike. And now you vnderstande why he is so Aronicall in his apparell, seinge he hath his high Priesthood by Aarons example in respect of his Bishoply apparell. But is this to resolue doubt, or is it not rather to make Pusie white with a blacke coale, to vse suche obscurities in

ite do

Trade of explications of great doubt: but **D. Dozman** speaketh moze plainly hereafter.

Dorman. Fol. 34

Hetherto **S. Austen**, by Whome we learne that it is no absurditie that two should be chiefe in two severall respectes, the one in overseinge and prescribing what shalbe done, the other in practising, and putting in execution, the thinges prescribed: the one absolutely without relation, the other in a respect by a comparison. As in the new lawe (a figure whereof diverse well learned men have expounded this priesthood of Moyses and Aaron to be) **Christ**: we see, is of his Church onely, simply and absolutely the head: Peter and after him his successours, no otherwise but in comparison of other inferior members. Moyses as he was with God more familiar then any other, as he received immediatly (without the helpe of any other instrument to convey it by vnto him) from the mouth of Almighty God his holy will and pleasure: he was there is no doubte thereof, the high and chiefe Priest. Aaron also, as he was by almighty God chosen to publishe to the people those thinges whiche Moyses had given him in charge: as he offered the sacrifices and executed the ceremonies, he had also therein the souerainie and superioritie.

Nowell.

Be it as **D. Dozman** saith, that it is no absurditie that two should be chiefe (Priestes) in two severall respectes, the one in overseinge and prescribing what shalbe done the other in putting in execution the thinges prescribed &c. we are contented therewith seinge it is no absurditie. Let it also I pray you, be likewise no absurditie that the Church nowe haue two high Priestes and two heades, be it in one, or divers respectes, I say let vs haue two and remoue vs away this your one onely head, that he in all respectes bothe of prescribing and executing, be not the onely

only head of the Church, as you do make him. You will say, I do require this against all reason: that he your selfe iudge of *M. Dozma*. These be your owne wordes:

*Dor. sup. fol. 7. b* I haue perceiued that God in that people in their lawe and Priest-hood shadowed out vnto vs, like a cunninge workeman the whole forme and proportion of his Church, &c. And shortly after you say, you may reason thus: It was so in the shadowe therefore it must be so in the bodie, and in the truth signified by the shadowe. These be your owne wordes *M. Dozman*, with many moe to that effect, in that place. Wherefore, as you affirme that there were tow high Priestes in that people, and in that lawe, let it be so in our Church now. Do not I pray you, marre Goddes cunninge workemanshippe: do not alter the forme and proportion of his Church, by him selfe set forth: but let vs now also good *M. Dozman*, be it in one respect, or in diuers, haue tow highe Priestes, one to ouersee and prescribe as did Moses, an other to erequite as did Aarō: & let not your one Pope be all in all, but that if the one do erre, as did Aaron, the other may controule him, as did Moses: if the one leade vs to Idolatrie, as your Pope, folowinge therein Aaron, hath done, the other may withdraw vs from it, as did Moses. And if the one play the tyraunt ouer vs, as hath your Pope of longe done, the other may by his authoritie (whiche he must by the saide forme and proportion haue ouer your Pope, as had Moses ouer Aarō) releaue and helpe vs in such oppression. Neither may you flie to this shifte, which you shortly after are faine to seeke at Caluines handes, that Moses example in hauinge and vsinge bothe the iurisdictiones Ecclesiasticall and Temporal, was but for a time: for Caluine so saith to exclude your Pope and his prelates from the claime,

and

and usurpatio of them both, by Moses example. And you of all others may worse alleage, that it was but for a time, y<sup>e</sup> there were tow high Priestes: for your wordes of the forme and proportio by God as a most cunning workeman, shadowed out to be obserued in our Church, as in the Bodie and truth, are spoken of that time when Moses and Aaron were together tow high Priestes (as you say) and when Moses had the superiortie ouer the high Priest Aaron: and your textes there alleaged out of Deuter. the 17. and 25. chapters, were writen when Moses had this authoritie ouer him. Wherefore either let this forme and proportion of the Church by God y<sup>e</sup> best workeman shadowed out to be obserued, as you do confesse, stil remaine, that we may haue some Moses to correct your Aaron the high Priest: or if you will nedes by Caluines helpe haue Moses be but a temporall example, and not to extend to Christian Princes, I pray you deale with your maister D. Harding, y<sup>e</sup> Moses example may be temporal also, to continue onely for that time, & not to extend to your Popes temporall Iurisdiction, as your maister extendeth it. And with all, let Aaron, as one onely high Priest, be a temporal example also, for the onely nation of the Iues: and extende not his example to the proufe of your one onely high Priest ouer all nations, in the worlde, which is a thinge plainely impossible to one man: deale you, who do finde faulte with others vneuen dealinge, euenly with vs in these matiers, I pray you. And if you will with Caluine haue Moses example temporarie, & peculiar to that time onely, let also with Caluine Aarons example be peculiar to the onely Iues, & the time of their Church, & extende it not to all times, & Churches. Neither can your figure any thing helpe you, that Moses

Dor. fol. 7. a. b.

Harding. Cōfess.  
Apol. fol. 305.

A REPROVVE OF M.

figured Chrifte as absolutely the highest Priest: and Aaron figured Peter as head in a respect and his successors Popes after him. For your maister D. Hardinge maketh Moses an example or figure of the Pope, as both Priest and King, and not onely Aaron, as you do of the Popes high Priesthood. And that Aarō, & the high Priests his successors were figures, not (as you saye out of your diuers surmised wel learned men, naming no: noting no man) of Peter and his successors, but of Chrifte him selfe that onely high Bishoppe, all the Scriptures do testifie, and S. Augustine, with all other ancient fathers do witness the same. And S. Cyprian with many other godly old doctours do make Aaron a figure or example of every Bishoppe in his owne Diocesse, and not of the Bishop of Rome ouer all diocesses. Wherefore you to resemble Moses to Chrifte, & your maister to resemble him to the Pope: you againe to resemble Aaron to the Pope, as head and high Bishop of al Churches, where the Scriptures and all the doctours resemble him to Chrifte, as that onely head and high Bishoppe: and S. Cyprian with others resemblinge him to every Bishoppe in his owne Church, not to one Bishop ouer y whole Church: to haue, I say, so many figures & examples continually to serue for your Popes, both spirituall and tempozall iurisdiction, and to make all examples tēporarie, whan they do proue the Princes authoritie ouer Priests, is no euen dealing: & I trust that you who so lately blamed the vneuen dealing of the authoz of the Apologie, will deale so euenly with vs, as to diminish nothing of that forme and proportiō by God as a most cūning workemans shadowed out in the Iuish Church, to be obserued in our Church as your selfe expressly doth affirme: & so ether to let vs haue tow high

Priests,

Confut. Apol.  
fol. 305.

Cyprianus lib. 3.  
epistola. 9. & lib.  
4. epistola. 9.

Priestes, as you say Moses and Aaron were: or elles as the truth was in deede in the Iusthe nation & Church, and as it is in all godly common wealthes, & Churches, let vs haue our Moses, to say, our Prince, & our Aaron, that is, our Bishoppes and high Priest: and let him be vnder the Prince as his Lord, according as was Aaron vnder Moses, his Lozde.

Dorman. Fol. 34.

And thus muche for answere to that obiection made of two high Priestes. But to make this matter more euident and to folowe my purpose, this is not saint Austens minde alone, that the man should so frette and fume at him therefore. For Gregorius Nazianzenus, hath of Moses and Aaron, in plaine woordes, that they were bothe Priestes, and alleageth to proue it (as saint Austen did) the Psalme where they are so called, with diuerse other auncient writers whome because I take the case to be cleare emongest the learned I here forbear to alleage: and am for this time contented (to giue to our aduersaries the larger scope) to put the case as though Moses had beinge no Priest, corrected and reprobued Aaron that was one, that he prescribed to him what he should doe, that he made him Priest as it appeareth by the scriptures he did. The whiche imagined to be true, I aske this question, whether it doe therefore folow that Princes being lay men, may at this day in matters of Religion, comptroll the Bishoppes, and prescribe vnto them what ordre they shall obserue and folowe therein? whether they may also giue orders to Priestes, and consecrate Bishoppes now, because Moses consecrated Aaron then? No truly if you will belue Iohn Caluine, it is an vntrue and a false collection. For that Moses saith he, had bothe the charges, that is of thinges as well Ecclesiasticall and spirituall as ciuile and politike together: to that I answere that it was done first by miracle, and secondarily that that was but temporall, till such time as thinges were better staied.

A. REPROVVE OF M.

For afterwarde saith he, as soone as God had ordeined a forme such Calvins an  
 as he would should continue, there remained to Moyses but onely the lver to th  
 civile governement, concerninge the priesthooch, it was necessarie obiectio  
 that he should resigne that to his brother Aaron. And good reason Moyles.  
 why, for it passeth natural power that one man should susteine both  
 the charges. Hether to Calvine.

Nowell.

The objection of tow high Priesttes at once, hath so  
 much in it, & you have saide so litle against it, and to so  
 litle purpose: that your owne discoursing about tow  
 highe Priesttes at once in this place, marreth all that  
 you here to fore have saide for one high Priest, or shall  
 hereafter say, for the Bishoppe of Rome, as that one  
 high Priest, and head of the whole Church. Where  
 fore it greeveth not me, though Pazianzene agree with  
 S. Augustine, that Moses and Aaron were bothe  
 high Priesttes, for they and all other ancient doctours  
 do agree that all Bishoppes by Goddes lawe be high  
 Priesttes, every one in their owne diocesse highest and  
 chiefest: and so that none is above them, but that  
 they be all equall, and therefore your Pope in ta  
 kinge vpon him to be the highe Judge, ouer the Jud  
 ges, and the high Bishoppe ouer all Bishoppes, is a  
 false vsurpar.

But here P. Dozma of his largious liberalitie, thinke  
 you (as he saith) or of doubt, of his formar dealinge for  
 Moses Priestthod is content for this time to have tow  
 stringes to his boe, one beinge cleane against an other,  
 that he may shote the streighter bilke. And to put  
 y case that Moses was no Priest, & that he beinge no Priest  
 corrected, and reprovved Aaron, that was one, that he prescribed

to him what he shuld do: made him priest, as appeareth by the scriptures he did, what than (saierb he) doeth it folowe therefore that Princes being lay men / shall doo the like, that they may at this daie in matiers of Religion controulle the Bishoppes, and prescribe vnto them what orders they shall obserue, and folowe therein, that they may geue orders, and consecrate Bishoppes now, because Moses consecrated Aaron than?

To his demaunde I answere, that Princes may not doo all the thinges whiche Moses did. And we demaunde againe, may your priestes, or your Pope him selfe, or can they doo the thinges that Moses did? If they can not? It is nothing to the derogation of Princes authozitie that they may not do al, that Moses did: whiche all your Popes and priestes may not, nor can not doo.

Touching giuing of orders, or consecrating of Bishoppes, we neuer saied that Princes might do suche thinges. Wherefoze it is in vaine to demaunde it, as though we had said, they so might.

You would inferre thereof, that Princes may not therefore reprove and correcte priestes offendinge, as Moses did Aaron. Bilike because they can not doo all thinges that Moses did, therefore they can do nothinge that he did. But by that reason your Pope may not geue orders, or consecrate Bishoppes, as Moses did to Aaron, soz that he can not deuide the sea, bzinge water out of a hard rocke, and do all the residue of Moses his myzacles. We graūt that Moses did sacrifice, did anoint and institute Aaron, and made him prieste by speccall commission, and therefore no example, ordinarly to be folowed, can be taken thereof. But that the reprovunge and correcting of Aaron the high priest offending, was

miraculous, and by speciall commission, M. Dozman  
can neuer proue. But that it was ordinary and ordina-  
rily to be solowed we will proue in this processe solow-  
ing, by the ordinary vsage of auncient godlie Princes,  
as wel of the ould Law, as of our Religion, beinge  
no Priestes, & yet ordinarily rejoyning and correcting  
Bishoppes and Priestes, as Moses did Aaron.

You doe very often pray aide of Caluine, whom and  
whose writings you doe professe that of all others you  
doe most detest: but moze inconueniently, than now, you  
neuer did alleage him. For first, you putting a case of  
Moses as no Priest, doe bring in Caluine to proue your  
purpose: who saith that Moses than vsed the priesthood,  
and had both the charges, as well Ecclesiasticall & Spi-  
rituall, as ciuill and politique together: but afterward  
(saith Caluine) it was necessary that Moses should re-  
signe ouer the priesthood to his brother Aaron, wherby  
it is eident, that whā he did those thinges, which you  
speake of, he by Caluins iudgement, was a Priest, and  
vsed the priesthode. Caluine therfoze should haue bene  
alleaged by you befoze, where you trauell so earnestly  
to proue Moses a Priest. Secondly, where Caluine ab-  
horring the vsurping of ciuill & tempozall dominions &  
iurisdications by your Pope and other Prelates, doth in  
the place by you here alleaged, declare that they cā not  
by Moses exāple (which was miraculous, & for a time)  
claime any such thing: you alleage this place of Caluins  
as against vs, with whō herein he doth most thzoughly  
agreē against you. Wherefoze you might better singe  
this song, that Moses authoritie to vse both the spiritual and tem-  
poral iurisdiction came to him by miracle, and was tēporal, for that  
it passeth naturall power that one man should susteine boeth the  
charges

charges as wel of the spirituall as of civil things: this songe I say, may you sing to your maister D. Harding, who as Hard. Confut. Apol. 305. boue all natural power and reason, gathereth of Moses myraculous & tempoꝛal authoritie, that Priestes, & specially your Pope may rule both Spirituallly & Tempoꝛally. But that the authoritie vsed by Moses ouer Aarō, which we do attribute to Princes, is not myraculous, but ordinarie, not tempoꝛal, but cōtinuall, thal appeare evidently by other godly Princes of y<sup>e</sup> Iues no priestes, and by Chꝛistia<sup>n</sup> Princes also ordinarie vsing the like. It is no myraculous noꝛ extraoꝛdinarie thinge for D. Dormā to bꝛig in places of Caluin, where he at large, and most expresse oppugneth the Pope & his pꝛelates inlust and vnoꝛderly vsurpatton, as though he therein had with them houlden against vs. But that it is no extraoꝛdinarie thinge in Caluins iudgement, soꝛ godly Princes to reꝛoue Priestes swaruing frō Gods word, as here did Moses to Aaron, is euident by Caluin euery where, where he intreats of this matter, as I haue at large befoꝛe declared. Caluin therefore in this & other places, is against your maister & you, and other your felowes, who consenting al, do attribute to your Pope both Tempoꝛal and Spirituall office, and rule: not against vs, who do make y<sup>e</sup> offices of a Prince & a priest, so distinct, that no Prince may bꝛeake into the office of a Priest, as to pꝛeache, to bynde and loose, to minister the Sacramentes: neither contrarie wyse, may a Prieste burst into pꝛincipalltie, and ciuill dominion, and iurisdiction, as Caluine in this place by you alledged, largely declareth to be expresse by Gods word soꝛbidden him. But these men, who so carefullie auoide all confusion of Princes and Priestes offices, that thei can

not

not abide that Christian Princes shuld controulle false  
 priestes erring from Gods woordes, and doe affirme it  
 to be extraordinarie presuming so to doe, which in dede  
 by the examples of all ancient godly Princes is proued  
 most ordinarie, and no presuming vpon Priestes office  
 at all: the same men can well abide that priestes shall  
 rule not onely spiritually, but temporally too, and not  
 onely controulle, but also depose and depriue Princes,  
 (as vsuallie, though most vnoorderly their Popes haue  
 done) and take vpon them to be lordes of all the world,  
 and high Emperours aboue al princes, as in their own  
 canon Lawe is recorded most contrarie to Gods word,  
 forbidding the same: and Caluine in the very same place  
 by M. Dozman here alleged as against vs, likewise te-  
 stifyng it to be against Gods word, and expressely there-  
 in forbidden.

Sex. Decretal.  
 lib. 3. tit. 16. cap.  
 Periculofo. in  
 glosa.

So we as Caluine saith, that your Pope & his prae-  
 lates can not claime both Ecclesiasticall and Ciuill do-  
 minion and iurisdiction by Moses example, for that it  
 was but temporarie and peculiar to that one onely time:  
 so teacheth Caluine, that your Pope can claime no high  
 Priesthood ouer the whole Church, by Aarons exam-  
 ple, for that it was peculiar to the onely nation of the  
 Iues, and their Church, to haue one onely high Priest:  
 and that it can not possible be that there shuld be like-  
 wyse one head ouer all nations, and all Churches: and  
 so that neither Moses no: Aarons example can serue  
 your purpose, and yet you bring in Caluine as against  
 vs. The very conclusion and effect of all your dislike is,  
 that Priestes, though neuer so wicked and abominable,  
 may not be controulled but by Priestes (a good caution  
 sure, Quando lupus lupinam non est) & that Princes  
 if they

if they controull Priests, do take vpon them Priests offices: but Princes, Kinges, and Emperours, may be controull'd by Priests, yea, and may be depofed from their dominions, kingdomes, and Empires, by them: and yet do they not herein take vpon them Princes offices, but do, as it apperteineth to them by their priestly right to do: for as D. Harding teacheth, Priests, & Conf. Apol. 305. Specially the Pope, may rule both Temporallic and Spiritually, but Princes may not. This is your doctrine of Princes and Priests: this is the practise of your Pope and his Brelates, moſte contrarie to the doctrine of our Saviour Chriſt, and his holie Apoſtles, and all godly aunctent Doctors, expreſſely forbidding Priests ſuch rule and dominion.

Dorman. Folio. 35.

Now if it be ſo that this auctoritie of Moſes came to him by miracle, or that he had it by eſpeciall commiſſion, then can we not you wor, of either of theſe two caſes gather a neceſſary conſequence. And thus might we anſwere our aduerſaries good Readers, euen by their owne Doctour. But cleauing to the ſcriptures, and aunctent fathers of Chriſtes church, we hold the firſt opinion that Moſes was a Priests, and that in that reſpect he had auctoritee ouer the Priests, and not as he was a Prince.

Nowell.

Why hath your maſter D. Hardinge than gathered this concluſion hereof. In that Moſes had both the offices, it proueth that a Priests may haue both, but not contrariwiſe that a king maie haue both. And againe. Now if Moſes were both, and his chief office was prieſthood, it ſoloweth by that example that the Pope may rule temporallic, but not that a king may rule ſpirituallic.

D. Hard. Confute  
Apolo. fol. 305.

At

Theſe

These you wot are your masters conclusions gathered of this example of Moses. You shuld therfore make this answer to your master & not to vs. For we do graunt that Moses did by myracle and by speciall commission, both mane other thinges, & also soyned the execution of diuers pointes of the Priestes office with his ciuill dominion: neither do we go about to gather any necessarie consequence thereof, that Princes now may do & like: whiche they neither do, noz desire to do: as doth your Pope & his prelates, & you do mainteine the same. But that Moses did reprove and correct Aaron erring & committing Idolatrie, either by myracle, or speciall commission, that we denie: and by the ordinarie doings of other godlie auncent Princes no Priestes, likewise reproving and correcting Priestes offending, it shal hereafter be plainly proued. As Eusebius and Socrates do in their histories Ecclesiastical compare Constantine and Theodosius the yonger, Emperours, with the same Moses, as like to him in sondre vertues & deedes, so dare we be bound to compare auncient godly Princes, reproving and correcting Priestes offending, to Moses doing the like: and by the example of both Moses, and them, may godly Christian Princes of our time reprove and correcte the wicked Priestes of our time: yea not reprove them onely, but remove them too. And so doing, shall folowe no myraculous example done by speciall commission, but the ordinarie office of all godly Princes, in all ages most vsually practised. Now that M. Doorman did knowe right well that all that he had saide in his case here put, was nothing to the purpose in deede, him selfe evidently declareth by recoiling back from his said case, whiche of his liberalitie he had a litle before put,

put,

Eusebius in vita  
Constant. lib. 1.  
fol 2. & fa. 162.  
& fo. 163. & rursum.  
165. 167.  
Socrat. lib. 7.  
cap. 42.

put, to geue vs the larger scope, as he saith. But now he bloweth the retreat to his former opinion, that Moses was a Priest, as vnto a safer ground to stand vpon. But thus to put the case, that Moses were no Priest, & to proue y<sup>e</sup> same by Caluine, who saith he was a priest, and bled the priesthood, that is, to mingle fire and water together: and when he hath all done after so leude prosecuting of the case, to put the case withall the implemētes thereof cleane away, is not his liberalitie towards vs, in geuing vs the larger scope as he saith, but rather his liberalitie towards him self, geuing him self a most large scope, to abuse both his owne time and the Readers patience also, with such leud triflinge, & found answering of vs, by our owne Doctours (as he saith) moste evidently declaring thereby to all discrete men his owne notable dotage.

To conclude: you see good Readers, that it can not by an Hebrew woorde of doubtfull signification, be doubtedlie, and most evidently (as saith M. Dormā) appeare that Moses was a Priest, specially after he had once instituted Aaron Priest: muche lesse doth it appeare that Moses had his authoritie ouer the highe Priest, not because he was a Prince, but in that he was a Priest, as M. Dormā affirmeth. You see also, that as it were apparent absurditie, one by his priesthood to be aboue the highe Priest, who by his office is highest of all other Priests: so is it no absurditie for a godlie Prince to be aboue the highe Priest, & to reprove him offending, as Aaron confessed Moses to be his lord, and patiently suffeined, when he was by him sustle reproved. And you may see that we haue no cause, muche to care whether Moses were a Priest, or no Priest:

Exod. 32. c. 12.  
& Leuit. 10. c. 16.

for were he no Priest, and yet both did direct and cor-  
 rect Aarō the highest Priest, as it maketh wholly with  
 the Apologie, and vs: so to graunt that he were a priest,  
 and so consequently that there were at once tow highe  
 Priestes, and of the tow, Moses to be the superiour, and  
 Aaron the inferiour, doeth ouerthrowe their doctrine of  
 one highe Priest, and the supreamacie of the same. And  
 further you see, how vnreasonable he alleageth out of  
 Caluine that the temporarie authoritie, whiche Moses  
 had by speciall commission and myracle, to be both a  
 Priest and a Prince is not to drawe into example, as  
 though that were against vs, who doe plainely teache  
 that the offices of Priestes and Princes are distincte,  
 and may not be cofounded: but it is most directly against  
 his matter D. Harding & other Papistes: who by that  
 example would establish the Popes myraculous or ra-  
 ther monstrous authoritie, in beinge both Priest and  
 Prince or Magistrate: to the reprobuse wherof as being  
 directly against Gods word, Caluine speaketh in that  
 place: who also teacheth that the example of Aaron as  
 one onely high Priest, was likewise peculiar to the na-  
 tion of the Iues, and not to be drawen into example for  
 one onely high Priest ouer all nations, and Churches,  
 nor no otherwise to be bled, but that euery Church or  
 Diocese should haue his Bishop, that is, his one high  
 Priest to gouerne it: and so that Caluin being so whol-  
 lie and clearlie with vs, & against them, is by M. Doz-  
 man as with them, against vs moste fondly alleaged.

And thus finally you see good Readers, that the ex-  
 amples as well of Aaron as of Moses, were he Priest  
 or no Priest, maketh with vs and against them.

The second  
exāple.  
Iosue.

*Dormans. Fol. 35.*  
The next example that they alleage is of Iosue, who beinge also a ciuile magistrate, receiued (they saie) at the time that he was appointed to gouerne the people, expresse commaundement and by name, of Religion and worshipping of God. But by what wordes that woulde I faine knowe. For in that chapitre by them in their Apologie alleaged, can I finde no wordes whereby there might be grounded in temporall men, as we call them, or ciuile magistrates any suche auctoritie ouer matters of religion, as they labour to induce. For firste this is out of all question, that in one of these two sentences it is which I shall here alleage, or that elles it is not there to be looked for. The first of the whiche two is this: **Confortare & esto robustus &c.** Be of good comfort and be stronge, that thou maiest kepe and doo all the lawe, whiche Moyses my seruauant hath commaunded thee. Swaue not either to the right hande or to the lefte, that thou maiest vnderstande all thinges that thou doest.

Hofius beginneth this treatise of the examples of the old testament. lib. 2. fol. 66. b.

D. Harding. Cōfut. fol. 305. b.

Is there here good readers any auctoritie given to meddle with religion? was there not as much as this cometh to, saied to euery one of the children of Israell, that they shoulde truly obserue the commaundementes giuen to them by Moyses? Is there not as much saide to euery one of vs touching the obseruinge of the commaudemētes of almighty God? and yet had neither the children of Israell then, nor we now, auctoritie ouer Religion pardie. The other sentence is this. **Non recedat volumen &c.** that is to saie: let not the booke of this lawe departe from thy mouthe, but thou shalt spende thy time both night and day in the meditation thereof, that thou maiest keepe and doo all thinges that are written therein. Then shalt thou direct thy way and vnderstande the same.

The same saith D. Hardinge. Cōfut. Apol. fol. 303. a.

Where I pray you is Iosua here commaunded to meddle with religion? in that that he is bidden to study the Scriptures? Now surely that is far fetcht and needeth no great refutation. For this knowe I well will they graunte, and for a maxima and very principle is

So saith D. Ward. Cōfut. fol. 303. a.

it holden in their religion, that these woordes pertaine to euery mā a like, as well to the Cartar as to the Kinge or Duke, and make as much for the one to be a Kinge, as they doo for the other to entremeddle in the order of Religion.

No well.

Whether there be nothinge to be founde in the first chapter of Iosua, for the authoritie of godly ciuill Magistrates in matiers of Religion, vnlesse it be in one of y<sup>e</sup> tow sentēces by D. Dozman here noted, we shal see hereafter. But those woordes which are by him here rehersted be sufficient to proue al y<sup>e</sup> the Apologie affirmeth of Iosua: which is, y<sup>e</sup> Iosua receiued cōmaūdemēt expresse, touching Religion, and the worshipping of God, for so much I am sure no mā but D. Dozman, wil denie to be contained in these woordes of that chapter: Ne declines &c. and Non recedat volumen &c. y<sup>e</sup> is to say: Thou shalt not swarue either to the right hande, or to the left from my law: that y<sup>e</sup> maist vnderstand al thinges that y<sup>e</sup> doest. Let not y<sup>e</sup> booke of this law departe frō thy mouth, but thou shalt studie therein both night & day, that thou maist keepe & do al thinges y<sup>e</sup> are writen therein: than shalt thou direct thy way, and vnderstande the same. Is not here I pray you an expresse cōmaūdemēt of God to Iosue, touching Religion, and the worshippinge of God: And moze the Apologie saith not.

Now cōcerning these woordes of God to Iosua twise repeted, Vt custodias & facias oēm legem, &c. & iterum. Vt custodias & facias omnia quę scripta sunt in volumine legis huius &c. y<sup>e</sup> is to say: That thou maist keepe and do all the law: and that thou maist keepe and do all thinges contained in the volume of this law: where D. Dozman saith there is no moze here laide to Iosua,

Apologia. g. 1.  
pag. 2.  
Accepti mādata  
nominatim de  
religione, deque  
colēdo Deo.

Iosua, than to euery one of the childzen of Israell, that  
 is, that thei should truely obserue the cōmandementes  
 geuen to them by Moyses, and be studious of the Scrip-  
 tures: and he addeth, that it is holden for a maxima, &  
 very p̄nciple in our Religion, that these wōrdes per-  
 teine to euery man alike, as well to the Cartar as to  
 the Kinge or Duke: it is M. Dozman that so saith, and  
 not we. For we, seinge the wōrdes vt custodias & fa-  
 cias, that thou maist kēpe, and thou maist dō all the  
 lawe twise repeted & spoken to the P̄ince, dō say: that  
 a greater charge is giuen to ȳ P̄ince than to euery one  
 of the common people, & that in the one vt facias, that  
 thou maist dō all the lawe, is a cōmandement touching  
 the P̄inces obeing of it him selfe: and in the wōrde, vt  
 custodias oēm legem, that thou maist kēpe al the lawe,  
 is a commaundement speciall to the P̄ince, to haue the  
 said lawe in his custodie, as by the Scripture it is eu-  
 dent he should haue, to maintaine the said lawe, and to  
 cause al other to kēpe it. And if this distinction like not  
 our aduersaries, sure I am, that no learned man will  
 dente, but that those wōrdes, custodies, & facias,  
 thou shalt kēpe, and dō the whole lawe, being twise  
 so nere together repeted, dō confesne a moze earnest  
 charge, than if it had been simplie once salde, facias, thou  
 shalt dō it. And where is added oēm legem, &c. all the  
 lawe, or the whole lawe, that, say we, doth signifie both ȳ  
 tables of ȳ lawe, as wel the first table, touching the true  
 wōrshipping of God, as the second, touching outward  
 god orde, iustice & honestie: which both to kēpe, & to sē  
 kept, say we, doth appertaine to a godly P̄ince. This,  
 ȳ authoz of the Apologie wryting but thre lines of Jo-  
 sua in this place, coulde not expresse, but onely touched  
 it, as

Princeps custos  
 legis.

it, as in such breuitie was necessarie. And he was the  
 Hofter, for that he had a few lines befoze thus witten  
 the same. Præterquam q̄ principi fideli à Deo man-  
 data est cura vtriusq; tabulæ &c. that is to say: bifides  
 that a Christian Prince hath the charge of both tables  
 committed to him by God, to thende he may vnderstād,  
 that not tempozal matiers onely, but also religious and  
 Ecclesiastical causes pertaine to his office. These be the  
 woordes of the Apologie, gathered out of these woordes  
 of God to Iosua in this place, and of suche like woordes  
 to other godly Princes in other places. Now will you  
 heare D. Hardinges answeare hereto: it is this. If you  
 D. Hard. Cōfut. *meane that the kinge oughte to see others to kepe both tables of the*  
 Apol. fol. 303. a. *law: that may be doo either in appoincting temporall paines for the*  
*transgressours of them, or in executinge the saide paines vppon the*  
*transgressours. But as he can not excommunicate any man for not ap-*  
*pearing when he is called, so cā he not iudge all causes of the law.*  
**Lo D. Dozman here is somewhat graunted by your**  
**maister that pertaineth not as well to the Carter as to the Kinge**  
**or Duke, and that maketh moze for a Kinge to intermedle**  
**in the ozdze of Religion, than it maketh for a Carter to be a**  
**Kinge, as it pleaseth you, pleasauntly (as you thinke) to**  
**play with these woordes. Here, I say, it is confessed that**  
**a Prince may either appoinct tempozall paines, for the**  
**transgressours of Goddes lawes of both the tables, or**  
**see the said paines erequented vppon the transgressours:**  
**this can not a Carter do, this your maister confesseth a**  
**Kinge may do. And if your Bishoppes and Priestes be**  
**transgressours of both the tables, you see y<sup>e</sup> Prince may**  
**see tempozall paines, as imprisonment, sequestration**  
**from their liuinge, or depriuations, if the cause so re-**  
**quire, to be erequented vpon them. And this keeping of**  
 all

all the law, or charge of both the tables we say, is here by God committed & commaunded to Iosua, what so euer you say. And what you say it forcéth not, for your maister confesseth the said charge of the kéeping of both the tables of Gods lawe by tempoꝛall paines, to apperteine to godly Pꝛinces: which being by your maister graúted, we say, proueth y<sup>e</sup> Pꝛinces may intermedle in the orde of religion, though you do denie it. Now y<sup>e</sup> which your maister excepteth after ward, *that a kinge can not excoꝛmunicate any man, nor, can not iudge all causes of the lawe*, we gladly admitte, & do thinke verely that no kinge will desire to excoꝛmunicate any man. And godly wise Pꝛinces which know they are not hable to iudge all causes of ciuill or mans lawes, will not pꝛasume to iudge all causes of Gods lawes. Which if your Pope do pꝛasume to do, he shalbe moze pꝛesumptuous, than either wise or godly. But will you also heare what Hosius answereth to y<sup>e</sup> like obiection y<sup>e</sup> Pꝛinces haue the charge of both the tables, and consider whether D. Harding boꝛowed not his answer of him. Nam & nos Magistratum itidem vt ille (Caluinus) custodē esse primæ & secundæ tabulæ legis, quod ad externā disciplinā attinet, profitemur. Debet enim prohibere externa scælera, punire scōtes, prohibere Idololatriā vestram, & blasphemias &c. y<sup>e</sup> is to say: For we also (saith Hosius) do pꝛofesse like wise as doth Caluine, y<sup>e</sup> the Magistrate is the kéeper of the first & seconde table, as much as apperteineth to the outward discipline. For the Magistrate ought to soꝛbid outward wicked deedes, to punish offendours, to soꝛbid your Idolatrie, & blasphemies: that the Magistrate suffer you not to set forth to y<sup>e</sup> people, in stæde of y<sup>e</sup> worde of God your owne worde, & it to be worshipped of the vnskilful people, as though it were Gods worde, onely

Hosius lib. 1.  
fol. 106. a.

Custos primæ &  
secundæ tabulæ

Tueri & pro-  
mouere.

Cū impijs culti-  
bus vestris.

for a few wordes, out of  $\text{y}$  Scriptures, by you brought  
& wrested to a wronge sense. The Magistrate ought to  
defende, & set forth the goodly doctrine which he hath fro  
the fathers, to fathers, as it were by hand receiued, and  
your wicked doctrine together, with your wicked wor-  
shippings ought  $\text{y}$  Magistrate to abolish & put away.  
Thus farre Hosius truely translate worde for worde.  
Lo here also D. Dozman an other maner of keeping of  
the whole lawe or both the tables confessed by your mas-  
ter his authour and yours, than appertaineth to the  
Carter, as well as to the Kinge. And we are well con-  
tent that the Christian Magistrate Kinge or Prince doe  
forbidde all outward wicked deedes, and punish all of-  
fendours: and doe forbidde Idolatries, and blasphemies,  
and suffer not mans worde to be set forth to the unskil-  
full people, and by them to be worshipped for Goddes  
worde, onely for a few wordes brought out of  $\text{y}$  Scrip-  
tures, and wrested to a wronge sense. Wee doe graunt  
that the Magistrate, Kinge, or Prince ought to defende  
and set forth godly doctrine receiued from the fathers,  
as it were by hande, and ought to abolishe and put a-  
way wicked doctrine with all wicked worshippings.  
Herein doe we agrée with your master D. Hardinge,  
herein we agrée with Hosius, your masters authour  
of this sentence. But we agrée not with you, who doe  
say, that this keepinge of the whole lawe, or both tables,  
doeth make as much for a Carter to be a Kinge, as for a Kinge to  
intermedle in the ordre of Religion. For, to punish out-  
warde wickednes, and offendours against both the ta-  
bles, to forbidde Idolatries, and blasphemies, to see  
that mans worde be not set forth and worshipped for  
Goddes worde, to defende mainteine and set forth god-  
ly doctrine and Religion, & to abolish wicked doctrine,  
Religion,

Religion, & rites (all whiche your authour Hosius particularly graunteth, and your maister D. Hardinge in effect, doeth graunt the same, to appertaine to the Magistrate, Kinge, or Prince) this we say, is to intermedle in the orde of Religion: and I beleue no man but you, will denie it so to be.

And thus you see good Readers how D. Hardinge, and Cardinall Hosius doe graunt that Kinges & Princes haue the keepinge or charge of both tables, or the whole law committed vnto them: as here was the godly Prince or Duke Josua commaunded to keepe the whole lawe, or to be a keeper of both the tables of the lawe, for all is one. But you will say, they are our Idolatries, our blasphemies, or wicked doctrine, Religion, and worshippinge, that Hosius saithe the Magistrate ought to forbidde, abolishe, and put away. We know he so saith: but will you say, that the godly Magistrate ought not likewise to forbidde, abolishe and put away your Idolatries, your blasphemies, your wicked doctrine, Religion, worshippinges, and rites: You will say you haue no such thinge in your Church: giue vs leaue to say the like for our selves, that we haue no Idolatries, blasphemies, wicked doctrine, Religion, nor rites: and giue the Magistrate, Kinge, or Prince, &c. leaue and authoritie, to forbidde, abolishe, and put away all Idolatries, blasphemies, wicked doctrine, and wicked Religion, where so euer they finde it, in you, or in vs: for so acknowledgeth D. Hardinge, so confesseth and professeth Cardinall Hosius, vnlesse your equitie and euen dealing will giue them this authoritie ouer vs, but not ouer your selves.

Now wheare Hosius speaketh of godly doctrine, as it were by hande receiued from the Fathers, no godly

doctrin so receiued will we refuse: & our doctrin which they refuse, we doubt not to proue y<sup>e</sup> we haue receiued it from the best, & most ancient holy fathers, & from the Apostles them selues the fathers of fathers: yea from Christ, who is befoze and aboue all fathers, and by the agreinge of our doctrin, with his doctrin in his holte woꝛde contained, we haue already so proued the same befoze both Magistrates, & priuate persons, befoze both Princes, and people, that a great numbꝛe of them are thꝛoughly perswaded, that not we, but you haue, & vse y<sup>e</sup> Idolatries, blasphemies, setting soꝛth of mans woꝛde foꝛ Goddes woꝛde, wicked doctrin, wicked Religion, wicked woꝛshippinges, & rites, by godly Princes to be foꝛbidden, abolished, and cleane put away. And thus I leaue it to this iudgement god Reader, whether Kinges and Princes, with other Magistrates, hauing with the keepinge of the whole lawe, oꝛ both tables, authozitie to punish offenders against both the tables, hauinge authozitie to foꝛbidde, abolish, and put away Idolatries, blasphemies, mans woꝛde, wicked doctrin, wicked Religion, & woꝛshippinges, (which is by the aduersaries confessed they haue,) haue not wit hall something to do with intermedling in y<sup>e</sup> oꝛdꝛe of religio: which M. Dozman here denieth y<sup>e</sup> Kinges & Princes haue. Now by the way: whereas God in the places by M. Dozman here noted, commaundeth Iosua a Souldier and man of warre, to studie in the Scriptures both night and day, no doubt he willethe Princes, who enioye the quietnes and leasure of peace, to do no lesse. And where God saithe, that the studie of his lawe dothe bringe a man to the knowledge and vnderstandinge of that he ought to do, and to the direction of his waies: how these men, who do keepe all men Princes and  
others.

others as muche as in them lieth, not onely from the studie, but from the reading and sight of the scriptures, as the cause of all errours, not the direction of mans wales: preferring ignorance, as the mother of deuotion, before knowledge what we ought to do, here by God commended: how they I say, do herein agree with Gods will and commaundemēt, I pray the good Reader consider.

And thus muche touching the tow places out of the first of Iosua which it pleased M. Dozman to note.

Now, where he saith that in the one of these tow places of that chapter by him alleaged, whatsoener may be said for ciuill Magistrates to haue any authoritie in matiers of Religio is to be found, or els it is out of al question that it is not there to be looked for.

You shall vnderstand, that a question or twayne may reasonable be moued of other places in that chapter, & that therefore it is not so cleare out or all question, as he would make it. For what saie you M. Dozman to these woordes of God in the same chapter, Sicut fui cū Mose &c. As I was with Moses, so wil I be with the: I wil not leaue the nor forsake the. And vpon this commission, the Princes of the people, with all the people together, to whom y said Princes were by Iosua sent, do sofnally say. Sicut obediuimus in cunctis Mose, ita obediemus & tibi &c. to say. As we obeted Moses in al things, so will we also obey the: onely let the Lord be with the, as he was with Moses. Whosoener shall gain say the mouth, & not obey all the woordes, whiche thou shalt commaund him, let him die. These be their very woordes, which do not a like belong to the Carter as to the King: neither do make as much for a Carter to be a King, as for a King to intermedle in the ordze of Religion, as it pleaseth you to saie.

Now sir, if they all will obey Iosua in all things, as they obeyed Moses: and they obeyed Moses in matters of Religion, (as is euident, and as is before by you confessed) why should they than not obey Iosua in matters of Religion: This is one question sir. An other question is, whosoever that gains say Iosua his monthe and not obey all his commaundementes that die: why shuld not than any of the Priesttes or Leuites, that is, any of the Clergie, gaine sayng or disobeyng Iosua, die also: You see here is an other question, and peradventure it will trouble your head to make a good answer thereto: and therfoze the matter is not cleare out of al question. I am sure you will be diuened of this absolute vniuersal proposition: as we obeyed Moses in all things, so will we obey thee, to make a particular, by restraining it, to matters of warre, & things temporal (as you call the) & likewise of thy vniuersal, whosoever that disobey the let the die. You will make a restraint to whosoever of the latter shall disobey the, let him die. But whether you may make such gloses vpon y word of God, or no, is a question also: and if you may, it is out of all question, y you will turne it like a shipmans hose, which way ye liste.

*Dorman. Fol. 36.*

¶ Vel may every man and ease by perceiue, how much they would haue triumphed, if they had had but one such text to serue their purpose for kinges, as the catholikes haue for priesttes out of the holie scriptures many. If they could haue founde but one place in al the whole corps of the scriptures, where had ben said that the lips of the ciuile magistrate should kepe the knowledge of Gods most holy will and pleasure, and his mouth be the treasure of the same, as is said of the priesttes: O lord how is it likely that their lippes, mouthes, and  
 tongues,

tongues should haue sworned and clattered thereof long before this, that ruffle so with the example of Iosue, because (or for no cause) that he was willed to study the scriptures, dissembling in the meane season the. 27. chap. of the booke of Numeri, where in plaine wordes it is to be foande, that Iosue was subiect to Eleazarus the high priest, at whose bidding the scripture saith he should go furth and come in, he and all the children of Israel.

D. Hard. Confu.  
fol. 305. obie-  
teth the same.

Nowell:

You neede not *D. Dormā* to speake of triumphing and ruffling so with the example of Iosua, the Apologie speaketh modestly & soberly thereof: lesse neede haue you to talke of lowning & clattering of lippes, mouthes, & tongues: the Apologie is most bylese, vttering al that it speaketh of Iosua, in lesse than foure lines, sayng, y he receiued rōmaundemēt of God by name of Religion, & the woꝝ, Whipping of God. Thus saith the Apologie: and here is neither triumphing, noꝝ ruffling: much lesse of lowning & clattering of lippes, mouthes, & tōgues. But some fond heads are ful of ruffling & triumphing toys, where no cause is: & haue belles & rattles, ringing & clattering continually in them, when al thinges be quiet & still. But now *D. Dormā* hath well declared, (as he thinketh) but how, you haue heard, that Iosua his exāple is simple, weake, farre fetcht, impertinent to our purpose, & needeth no great refutation: he doth of notable art oppose, and sette against it, as it were a Giant against a Child, the strongest firmamēt, and impregnable bulwarke, y he hath for y authoritie of priests aboute *D. Dormā*, that is: the lippes of the Priests should keape the knowlege of Gods most holie wil and pleasure: and his mouth should be the treasure of the same: wherof he made mētion afoze. O lord saith *D. Dormā*, if thei could find but one the like text out of the whole

Apologia. g. 7.  
pag. 2. Acce-  
pit mādata no-  
minatim, de re-  
ligione, de q; co-  
lendo Deo.

Dor. sup. fo. 13. b.

corps

corps of the Scriptures, for kinges: how their lippes, moultes, and  
 tongues, would sound and clatter thereof. These be **M. Doz-**  
**mans** wordes. Nowe surely **M. Dozman**, I am right  
 glad that we have no like text for **Christia Princes**, as  
 is this yours for **Prestes**: for as I have before declared,  
 whā God by his **Prophet** hath tould the **Prestes** what  
 was their duetie, & what knowlege in his worde they  
 ought to haue in their lippes, what guides to his people  
 they shuld haue bene, how honest a life they shuld haue  
 led: he doth than declare, what in dæde the said **prestes**  
 were, that is: such as had departed from the right way,  
 & had erred both on the right hand, and left, & therefore  
 not to be folowed in their wrong waies, suche as cau-  
 sed many to offend against the Lawe, & seducers of the  
 people that folowed them, breakers of Gods couenant,  
 partial, & accepters of persons: and that God had there-  
 fore brought the said **Prestes** into cōtempt amongst al  
 people. Such is the text of **ḡ Prophet Malachie**, wherof  
 you thus bragge & triumphe, suche were the **Prestes** &  
 their leud lippes, wherof your lippes, now do thus sound  
 & clatter, (for I may fastly answer you in your owne  
 termes & wordes) & their lippes being such, & so boide of  
 all god & godly knowlege, you were not ashamed with  
 your lippes there to make a loud leud lte, saing: that the  
 Prophetes doo promesse that the Priestes lips shuld not misse to heape  
 true knowlege. Wherefore it is not without great cause **ḡ**  
 you once again clatter & brag of these leude lippes, and  
 of this, the which emongest others, doeth mosse liuelie  
 set forth, and as it were, depaunte your **Pope**, and his  
**Prestes**, breakers of Gods holie couenaunt, straters  
 from the right waye on both handes, seducinge of the  
 people, and mosse corrupt, and partiall menne.

I praye

Malach. 2.

Hier6. in Mala.

Dor. sup. fo. 18. b

I pray God we finde no such texts for our Christiā p̄ces, for if we do I assure you we will not brag nor boast muche of them, as you do of this your notable texte for Priestes: wherof yet had you had as much discretion in your head, and vnderstanding in the textes of the scriptures, as you had plenty of inke in your penne, neither woulde you haue writt somuche hereof, neither shoulde your lippes, mouth, and tongue, haue sounded and clattered so muche, nor you haue made suche a ridiculous, I wot not, or rather ruful ruse, there about. And thus I trust I haue sufficiently declared that the Apologie doeth well, with great modestie, bzeuitie, and to good purpose, vse the example of Iosua: and that the same dooth effectuoulye bothe reprove manifolde vnruthes and abuses of the papistes, and also confirme the right of p̄inces to deale in maters of Religion, and that M. Doorman without all cause deriding the vse of the saide example, hath shewed him self therein to be moſte ridiculous.

Where M. Doorman complaineth that we dissemble the

Num. 27.

27. Chapter of Numeri, wher in plaine words (he saith) it is found that Iosue was subiecte to Eleazarus the high Prieste &c. I can, I assure you, finde no suche plaine words of the subiectio of Iosue to Eleazarus: and if it will please the good Reader to peruse with diligence that whole chapter, thou shalt, I think, finde no one word, much lesse plaine words, of eny such subiectio: but that it is plainly sub-

subditum et sup  
positum. Vide Hard. C6.  
fut. Apol. fol.  
305. b.

ject, and thrust in, as a word of the text by you M. Doorman. Your M. Doctour Harding, who speaketh of this place likewise, could not as by his words appeareth, in plaine words finde, that Iosue was subiect to Eleazar. Truthe it is, that Eleazarus the highe Priest did aske

Et

councill

council of the Lord for him, and that vpon his word, he and all the Children of Israell shoulde go forth & come in. But that dooth no more proue that Iosua was subiect to Eleazarus, than that Kinge Czechias desired Esaias to aske council of the Lord for him: and that king Iosias sent to Holda, the profetisse a womā, to ask councel of the Lord in maters of Religion to, and that the said kinges did accordinge to their council, dooth proue the said Kinges to be subiecte to a more seely Prophet or a seely woman, who I am sure were neyther of them highe Priestes: and surely we are not against it, but that Princes shall heare not onely the highe Priestes and Bishops, but euery ecclesiasticall ministre, bynging with him Gods word, as here Eleazarus is commaunded to do. But if I would restraine Eleazarus authoritie to the onely going out, and comming home, to, and from the warres, whiche are worldly affaires, and no maters of religion, as the verye wordes of the text doe seeme to sounde, and the practise after warde dooth agree to the same. What can M. Doorman, or the Papists say thereto, who vse the selues more vnlikely and vnrasonable restraints against the authoritie of princes: In whiche case Iosua is yet no more subiect to Eleazarus, than was Theodosius the Emperour subiect to the more godly Monke of Egypt, named Ioannes: who gaue him knowledge when he shoulde haue prosperous successe in warres. Now if it please M. Doorman that no restraint be here made in this chapter of Numeris, for that some thinge is to be said thereout for the hyghe Priest, I receiue the condition, and pray M. Doorman that he wil not deale vneuenly with me. (which he doth blame so muche in other men) but that the wordes in the

Egredietur, &  
ingredietur.

Theodoret. lib.  
5. cap. 23.

Numeri, cap. 27.

the same very place immediatly next befoze the woordes  
 by M. Dozma, for the high Priest's authoritie alleaged,  
 may also be free from all restraint. which are these: Au-  
 diat Iosua omnis sinagoga filiorum Israell. Let all  
 the Sinagoge, Congregation, or Church of the childzen  
 of Israel, heare (that is to say) obey Iosua. Let vs I say,  
 here haue no restraining to the Laity onely, nor excep-  
 tion of Prestres, or church men, speciall ye seinge the  
 woorde Sinagoga, is no aliene nor straunger to them.  
 Po we whereas M. Dozman chargeth vs with dissem-  
 blinge of this place in Numeri, whiche as you see, we  
 had no cause to dissemble: howe muche moze iust cause  
 haue we to charge him, and other Papist, who doo so  
 deepely dissemble so many thinges in the booke of Iosua,  
 mooste evidently makinge for the authoritie and chiefe  
 gouernement of Princes, ouer Priest, and in matters  
 of Religio. As that the Priest remoued and stayed the  
 arke of couenant at Iosua his commaundement. That  
 he commaunded the Childzen of Israel to be circum-  
 sed: an aultar to be builded: sacrifice to be offered, acco-  
 ding to the law of God: the Deuteronomie to be writ-  
 ten vpon the stones: Gods commaundements, blessing  
 and cursings to be read to the people: and that him selfe  
 both exhorted the people to the obedience and seruite of  
 God, and feared them from all Idolatrie, and impietie  
 most earnestly. All this and muche moze doth M. Doz-  
 man, and his M. Doctour Harding moste deepely dissem-  
 ble, being plainly set forth in the booke of Iosua: and in  
 the meane time the one gyzeth at our handsome prouing of  
 our matiers, the other talketh of our farre fetching of our ma-  
 tiers, and dissembling of a place in Numeri. which plainly ma-  
 keth for vs.

Iosue. 3. cap. 6.  
 Iosue. 5.  
 Iosue. 8.  
 Iosue. 32. & 34.  
 Harding. cofut.  
 Apolog. 305. b.

Dorman fol. 36.

It foloweth, that King David brought home the arke restored religion, was present not onely as to admonishe or encourage them that accompanied it, but deliuered also to them psalmes and himnes, disposed the order of every thing, instituted the ceremonies and solemnities, & ruled after a sort the priests. That David brought home the arke it ca not be denied, to the house at the least of Obed Edō. Although in an other place we read, how David being stroken with a mercuri-  
 louse feare, for that which so lately before he had seene happen vnto Oza, for the onely stayeng (being no priest) the Ark, which other wise was in great daunger to fall: he would not presume to cary the same into the tabernacle prepared to receiue it, but called vnto him Sadoc and Abiathar the priestes, willing them in expresse words to carye it to the place appointed therfore, lest happely God might strike the once againes for doing the like vnlawful act to that, which through their absence before they had done. He made psalmes & wrote hines to the glory and praise of God. And who is there I pray you that at this day forbiddeth any Prince or Kinge to do the lyke? He appointed and established to serue the temple for euer, some to singe, some to play on the organes, some and a great some, the scripture hath forwer thousand, to keepe the doores. And what conclude they hereof, if David had appointed players and singing men as he did not, but willed the chiefe of the Leuites to appoint some of their brethern thereto? that therefore he was cheif gouernour in all causes ecclesiasticall. O what new logicke is sodenly sprong vp with their new diuinitie.

The 3. example.  
 1. Paralip.  
 Cap. 13.

1. Paralip.  
 Cap. 15.

The bringing home the arke without the priests acknowledged by David to be an vnlawful act.

1. Par. 15.

Hofius. lib. 2.

fol. 67. 2.

The same answer

reth D. Harding

Confut. Apol.

fol. 305.

Translated word for word out of

Hofius. lib. 2.

fo. 66. b. et 67. a.

Nowell.

King David did not only bringe home the Arke to the house of Obed, but also brought it after ward home into the Citie of David, & placed it in the tabernacle which he had there made for it. That he used the helpe of the Leuites in the carying of the arke (seing it appertained

to their peculiar office so to doe) what meruall or new  
 to that: Who euer denied but that the Leuites & priests  
 ought to doo their office: we euer graunted also, that by  
 the example of Dauid, (whiche you likewise haue beoow-  
 ed of Hosius) mi be warned not to entermedle in other  
 mens offices, nothing to them appertayning. That *D.*  
*Dorman* permitteth to Christiana princes to write psalmes  
 and himnes to the glozy and praise of God, it is liberal-  
 ly doone of him: had he also added with Hosius (out of  
 whome he hathe ad verbum translated all this stuffe,) *Hosius lib. 2. fol*  
*66. b. & 67. a.*  
*Scribimus indocti doctiq; poemata passim. that is,*  
*Learned and vnlearned (it maketh no matter) we write poesies*  
*euery where: than had D. Dorman* worthely behaued him  
 self (like my Lord Cardinalls Chaplaine) in deriding of  
 the Scriptures, and comparing of Dauid psalms with  
 vaine and vnlearned poesies, as doth Hosius ful like a  
 Cardinall of Rome, where he laugheth at our new Lo-  
 gicke sodenly sprong vp with our new diuinity, he doth  
 by his good righte and authoritie, seinge he is him selfe  
 known to be so vnreasonable and subtille a Logician,  
 and so auncient and profound a Diuine. He frameth our  
 argument in deed after his owne Logique in this man-  
 ner. *Dauid (saith he) appointed and established to serue*  
*the Temple for euer, some to singe, some to play on the Organs, some*  
*and a great some (the scripture hath iiii. thousand) to keepe the doores:*  
*and therefore Dauid was chief gouernour in all causes ecclesiasticall:*  
 this is the argument whiche *D. Dorman* saith is the  
 Apologies, and ours. But good Reader, peruse diligent-  
 ly the whole treatie of the Apologie concerning Kinge  
 Dauid, whiche is but short, contayninge lesse then fiftie  
 little lines, and thou shalt there finde, neither this ante-  
 cedent, noz consequence, noz entie parte thereof, where-  
 fore

foze it is in dæde a nue & mervallous kinde of Logique, to confute that, in the Apologie, whereof no one worde can there be founde. But in dæde *P. Dozman* findinge mention made by *Hosius* of singing men, organ players, and portars, taken out of the storie of *David*, wold not omitte it, but hath likewyle brought it in, to saue harmelesse thereby, their like vsage in *Christes* church. Wherefoze it is not the Apologies and our argument, but *Hosius* and *P. Dozmas* deuilte. And he may as reasonable (if he list) bying in for example, all other Iustitites and ceremonies, wherewith they haue ouerwhelmed the Church of *Christ*: and of *Christians* made vs moze than halfe *Jews*. But the reason of the Apologie dependeth vpon other most notable doings in matters of Religion, and the authoritie vsed vnder *Priestres* by *King David*, declared throughout the whole first booke of the *Chronicles*, from the .xij. chapter to thende thereof, as shall here be declared. When all Religion was in *King Saules* time neglected, and the arke of *God* absent, the *Scriptures* do not teache, that the *Priestres* them selues tooke counsell about the determination, what was in suche case to be done, or that they moued the *King* thereto, but that *King David* taking a purpose of him self, to bying home the *Arke*, and to restore Religion, consulted with his *Princes* and nobles about the same, and was by *God* directed therein: and that he summoned or called together all the *Priestres* and *Leuites*, to say, all the *Clergie* for that purpose. Here is an example, that goodly *Princes* do regard matters of Religion, that *God* doth moue them thereto, & that they haue authoritie to sommon the *Clergie* to *Synodes* or *Confels*, about the restoring or redressing of the same. *King David* also did admonish the said *Priestres* and *Leuites*

Lib. 2. contra  
Bren. fol. 67.

1. Paral. 13. a. 1.

1. Paral. 13. a. 1.  
Inijt consilium  
David cum vni-  
uersis principi-  
bus. &c.

2. Paral. 13. a. 2. &  
35. a. 4.

1. Paral. 13. a. 1.  
b. 12. Vos q estis  
principes familia-

Leuites

Levites, of their duetie, & comāunded them to do it. An  
 example y other godly Princes may do the like. King  
 David was also chiefe overseer in y bringinge home of  
 the Arke, & in seinge all other ceremonies, & rites apper-  
 teininge to Religion done, in such sort, as than pleased  
 God to haue vled: in so much y the Scripture saith that  
 David whan he had fulfilled the burnt offeringes, and  
 peace offrings, blessed the people in y name of the lord.  
 Where note y the Scripture, for that chiefe authoritie  
 which was in king David in the ouersēing & comāun-  
 ding of y Priestes to do their sacrifices & other dueties,  
 saith y king David fulfilled them. An erāple, & pzoufe,  
 that all godly Princes haue the like authoritie. David  
 also appointed such of the Levites, as should serue con-  
 tinually befoze the Arke of the Lozde, & praise & glorifie  
 the woꝝkes of the Lozde God of Israel. And y Scripture  
 sheweth expressly, how David appointed the Princes  
 of the Levites, as Asaph, Zacharia, Iabiell, Semirāth,  
 Gathathia, & a great number of other of the chiefe offi-  
 cers of the Cleargie, there by name expessed: & which is  
 moſte of all, how he appointed Sadocke the Priest his  
 office. Pea the very summe and title of the.24. chapter  
 of the first booke of the Chronicles is Assignat David  
 officia filijs Aarō. y is: David assigned to Aarons chil-  
 dzen their offices. Whiche thinge S. Ambrose did well  
 vnderstande, as appeareth by these his woꝝdes vppon  
 S. Paules firste epistle to Timothie. Multitudo erat  
 sacerdotū, & magna copia Leuitarū &c. y is to say:  
 there was a multitude of Priestes, & great plentie of y  
 Levites, & euery one at their certen time serued y diuine  
 ceremonies, accoꝝding to y ordināce of king David, who  
 appointed. xliij. sortes of Priestes, y they might serue  
 by course. Thus saite S. Ambrose. Now as this kinge  
 David

rū leuitarū sū-  
 cificamini, &c.  
 1. Paral. 15. d. 25.  
 &c.

1. Paral. 16. a. 27  
 Cum cōpleſſet  
 David offerens  
 holocausta &c.  
 benedixit popu-  
 lo, &c.

1. Paral. 16. a. 40  
 Cōstituit David  
 coram arca Dñi  
 de Leuitis, qui  
 ministrarēt, &c.  
 Cap. 16. a. 5.

1. Paral. 16. d. 39

Ambros. in. 1. Tim.  
 moth. 3.

Ambrosius.  
 Secundū institu-  
 tū David hic e-  
 nim. 24. classes  
 constituit sacer-  
 dotum, vt vicib⁹  
 David deseruirent.

1. Par. 15. d. 40.

Dauid appointed and assigned according to  $\gamma$  which he found written in the law of the Lorde, as is recorded in the scriptures. All this I say old King Dauid, and yet did not God strike him, as dealing with things impertinent to his office, as he did a litle before strike *Dia*, and afterward King *Dias*. An example to our godlye p $\gamma$ inces to be folowed, and that in the folowing thereof they shall not displease God. Seeing therefore there are so many, so notable, and so effectuous examples of King Dauid, written throughout the whole booke of the firste of the *Chronacles*, from the xlii. chapter to the end of the booke, containing xxx. chapters, so direaly making for vs, & against *H. Dozma*, his master Doctor *Hardig*, their authour *Hosius* & all suche oppagners of p $\gamma$ inces right, and maintayners of the popes and his Priest $\gamma$  v $\gamma$ surpation: yet could *H. Dozman* see none of those so many and so notable thinges, but dissembling them all at once, folowing *Hosius* word by word, falleth to the reckeninge of his singing men, *Players*, and *Porters*, of whom the *Apologie* speaketh not one word: and thereupon frameth his argument, and calleth it ours: and than laugheth loude at this new *Logicke*. And all this doth he, to make our side as strong as he possible can, according to his promise, you may be sure. *Yea* & further to weake moze the reason of the *Apologie*, he admonisheth the Reader, that *Dauid* did not appoint himself singing men and *players* (belike for that the King durst not, or might not assigne suche highe officers and offices, but willed the chiefe of the *Leuites*, to appoint some of their brethren therin: hereby to perswade the readers that *Dauid* by his office being a King might not appoint them, as being of the Clergie whereas he exp $\gamma$ essly appointed all  $\gamma$  chief of the Clergie

*Hosius* lib. 2. fol.  
66. & 67.

*Dorman*, supra  
fol. 30. b.

oꝛ Pꝛinces in the Leuites, (as the termes in the Scrip-  
 tures be) to their offices, and theretozẽ might muche  
 moꝛe rather, if he would, haue appoynted singing men,  
 players, and portars: to the whiche offices this daye in  
 the Popishe churche, mere tempozall men (as they call  
 them) are vsually appoynted: and yet would M. Doꝛmã  
 haue them seeme to holie bilike, by his iudgement, foꝛ  
 Pꝛinces to deale with. But sir, first of all the Apologie  
 hath not one woꝛde of singing men, oꝛ plasers, appoin-  
 ted by one oꝛ other: wheretozẽ as I haue saide, you doe  
 not herein confute the Apologie (whose reason you dis-  
 semble) but you go about an other purpose, and to seeke  
 thanke of certen soꝛtes of men, which I inuse you not.  
 But that Dauid did appoina higher officers Ecclesiasti-  
 call, then be either singing men, oꝛ plasers, (whiche is  
 but touchèd and signified by the Apologie in as great  
 bꝛeuitie as may be) I haue at large declared. Whereby  
 all men may vnderstande, that king Dauid appoynted  
 not them, was not foꝛ that he might not appoincte sin-  
 ging men, plasers, and suche other, so high and holy of-  
 fices, (as M. Doꝛman would haue it seeme) but foꝛ that,  
 he being busie about higher officers, and matters, com-  
 mitted the care of other meane matters, and officers, to  
 meaner men, than him selfe was. And where M. Doꝛ-  
 man mollifieth the woꝛdes of the Scripture, Dixit  
 Dauid principibus Leuitarum, vt cõstituerent can-  
 tores &c. by a soofte interpretation, sayng: *Dauid wil-  
 led the chiefe of the Leuites to appoincte singing men:* Dauid in  
 dede commaunded the chiefe of the Leuites to doe it.  
 And whether he that commaundeth a thing to be done,  
 oꝛ they that be commaunded, & doe obey, be superiours,  
 let all indifferent men iudge.

All these things considered, & how M. Doorman deeply dissembling so many, & so notable actes of King David, concluding directly against him, falleth to the reberrall and numbring of singing, m. plaies, and porters, not once mentioned in the Apologie: and so goeth about to confute the reason of the Apologie, framinge a consequence, whercof neither antecedent, nor consequent, nor any one part thereof is to be founde in the Apologie: and that done, how he insulteth against vs, saying: *O what nue Logike is sodenlie sprong vp. With their nue diuinitie: might it not most iustly be replied, What a nue Logique, & strange diuinitie, yea and maruelous poetrie too, and specially wonderfull Rhetorique is this which M. Doorman here vseth? Surely it deserueth not onelie a great D, whiche is an interiection of wondering: but if M. Doorman vpon admiration of his owne doinges would protract the said D at length, as the Papistes vsed to do the last D, in a verse of S. Nicolas hymne, he shold do right wel and conueniently: so, surely the matter deserueth no lesse.*

Interiectio admirantis.

Dorman. Fol. 37.

Hofius saith the same of the Kinges of Polonia. fol. 67.

How many notable Kinges hath our litle countrie had, whiche in their daies haue establis hed for the like purposes like fundatiōs, by our aduersaries at this date almost all ouerthrowen, of whom no one euer by this meane, thought him selfe any thing the more auctorijsed, to gouerne in matters of religion the cleargie, of his countrie. But for this example that whiche I haue alreadye side may suffice, both because I thinke they leane not much therto, for that they can shewe noe great store of Kinges, yea I maie be bould to saie none at all, by them perswaded to builde any churches, or so establis h any fundatiōs of such as shold there continually serue God, and also for  
that

that the place it selfe (how euer in the Apologie the conclusion con-  
taine more then the premisses) seemeth not to be brought in directly to  
proue any suche thing. For our Apologie which allegeth it, hath one  
h. & quodammodo prafuit sacerdotibus, that is, and in a man-  
ner of after a sort he was alone the priestes. And therefore will I  
proceede to their other examples.

Nowell.

Mr. Doorman proceedeth, and following Hosius word  
by word, applieth all King Dauids doings to funda-  
tions (of Abbets and Colleges bylike) by our Kinges for  
merime builded, and now by vs (saith he) almoste alto-  
uerthrowe. Why sir, the fundatio which Dauid made,  
was but of a tabernacle, which endured not longe: and  
fir the place by you alleaged, there appeareth no great  
dotation of the Clergie giuen them by Dauid, but the  
fethes onely, assigned the before by Moses, to lue vpon.  
And al the fundatio that Dauid here made, was for  
publike seruice of God, not for priuate and secret mone-  
rings in cozners: wherfore this example of Dauid for  
your fundatiō is but very simple. But how Dauides ex-  
ple serueth vs, hath heretofore moſte plainly apared.

Hos. li. 2. f. 67.

Where you burthen vs here againe with the enaie of  
Abbets ouerthrowe by vs, as you say. I haue answered  
that vnttrue flander, at large before in mine answere  
to Mr. Doorman his first proposition, the. 13. leafe and so  
furth, & do pray the good Reader, whiche hath not read  
that place, or doth not remembre it, to resort to it, and I  
trust, he shall be satisfied therein.

Now, where he finally that geth the Apologie, that  
the conclusion in it containeth more than the premisses,  
it is most vntrewe, for that the care of Religion doth be-  
pertaine to godlie Iudices, as the conclusion in the

ed. 17.

Wb 2

Apolo.

Apologie: and that is well proued by the premises of the example of King David, and of other godly Princes, who by their actes doe shewe and proue, that the care of Religion appertained to them: the whiche thing for King Davids parte, I have declared, and shall shortly shewe moze at large of other godlie auncient Princes, to the full satisfiing of the discrete Reader: as I trust. He would also for that the Apologie saith, that King David was about the Priestes, quodammodo, that is, in a manner, or after a sorte, proue thereby, that the Apologie and we make no great account of this example of King David, as greatly to our purpose. Whereunto I answers: that the example of King David serueth our purpose right well: and so I trust, it hath well appeared: and that the Apologie doth yet well vse the worde quodammodo, *after a sorte* in Davids example. For David was not absolutely about the Priestes in all things and offices: he abstained from bearing of the Arke, and such like things, specially appertaining to the Priestes, or Levites office: wherein he neither was about them, neither medled he at all in the execution & doing thereof, no moze than do our Kinges and Princes in the ministeringe of the Sacramentes, preaching, binding & loosing, whiche be the peculiar offices of Priestes, as the ministers of God, and his Church therein. But in these things was King David about those Priestes. In thinking upon matters of Religion, & caring for the reformation thereof, when (as it seemeth by y<sup>e</sup> scriptures) the priestes had little regard therto: In consulting w<sup>th</sup> his counsell therabout: In calling of y<sup>e</sup> priestes together therabout. In admonishing them of their dutie, and commaunding the to do it.

In be

2.  
1. Paral. 13. a. 2.  
&c.

2.  
Ibidem. a.

3.

4.

& Cap. 15. a. 4.

In beinge the chiefe overseer in the reformation of Religion, and over the Priestes, and Levites, that they should doe their duetie. In assigninge and appointinge the Levites and Priestes, and the very chiefe of all the Cleargie, to their severall offices. In that David did all these thinges accordinge to the lawe of the Lorde.

In that God did not strike him as he did a litle before Dya, and afterwarde kinge Dya, as intermedling with thinges impertinent to his office (as they did) but directed, assisted, and prospered him in all these his doinges: as wherefoze God was right well pleased with him, as doinge the office, and duetie of a godly Prince. These are the premisses: this is the quodammodo, that the Apologie speaketh of. Whereof I doubt nothinge, but both the conclusion in the Apologie, to witte that the care of Religion appertaineth to godly Princes doth full well follow: and our conclusion also, that godly & Christian Princes be chiefe governours over Priestes, and in matters Ecclesiasticall, doth most necessarily, & fully followe of the same. This quodammodo, will serve our turne, as muche, as for kinge Davids example well enough, to mainteine & establishe thereby the due right of godly Kinges and Princes, and to reproue, and condemn the false Usurpatio of wicked Popes, with their Prelates, and Priestes.

Dorman. Folia 37.

Salomon (they say) builded and dedicated to God a Church, D. Harding. C6. Reg. ca. 8. made to the people an oration concerninge Religion and worship- fut. Apol. fol. pinge of God, deposed Abiathar the Bisshoppe placinge sadoc in his 306. roome.

Ezechias purged the temple, commaunded the lightes to be kindled.

Tab 3.

led.

Ibidem. d. 25.

6

1. Paral. 16. 2. 4. 5. &c. & cap. 24. 2 totum.

7

8

1. Paral. 16. d. 40.

led, incense to be done and sacrifice offered, after the old accustomed manner: finally the brazen serpent, which was then worshipped by the people, to be utterly taken away and broken all to pieces.

Iosaphat took away the hills and wooddes wherby the people was hindered from the common temple of Ierusalem: Iosaphat.

Iosias warned the Priests and Bishoppes of their duties: Iosias.

Iosias restrained their riot and insolency; and last of all, Iehu put the wicked Prophetes to death. Iehu.

Translated out  
of Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. 66. b.

These be the examples good readers whiche the aduersaries to the truth bringe for the maintenance of the contrarie, out of the olde Testament. Whiche manner of reasoninge from examples in that age vsed, if it might be at these dayes in all pointes lawfull to follow, what and how huge a nombre of inconueniences, might by this consequence thereupon be easely grounded and brought in. I neede not here to rehearse, any man but meanely exercised in the holy scriptures may with him selfe easely conceiue.

No well.

As Mr Dozman was befoze copious & plentiful about the seueral answering of the three examples of Moses, Iosias, and Kinge David, of his liberalitie bringinge in singinge men, plaiers on the Orgaines, porters, & doore keepers, foure thousande, and moe, of whome the Apologie speaketh not one worde, no: no man elles, but his without Hosius, and he: so is he now as curtall, & brieft, in the wrappinge vp of these three examples, of Solomons, Hezekias, Iosaphat, Iosias, Iosias, and Iehu together. And ye may not doubt, but y both that former prouerbe, and this present bzeuitie, are both vsed by Mr Dozman, for that he would gene vs no cause to complaine of any

Dorman supra  
fol. 17. b. & 30.

his suppressinge, concealinge or obscuringe of our necessarie prouises one way or other, as one that coueteth to make our parte most stronge

as he hath promised he would do. Or els ye must thinke  
 y<sup>e</sup> M. Doorman considering so many actes & exampls, so  
 largely, so plainly set forth throughout so many booke  
 of the Kinges, & Cronicles, so effectuouly declaring the  
 authoritie of Princes ouer Priestes, & their intermed-  
 ling in matiers of Religion, as euē by those brieue notes  
 of their deedes, (which M. Doorman could not dissemble)  
 is manifestt enough: and perceiuing that the seueral an-  
 sweare therof would be both cumberous & tedious vnto  
 him, thought it good to wrape them together, & by one  
 generall answer not onely to blemishe our said profes-  
 sor Princes prerogatiues in Church matiers, cōteined  
 in these exampls: but also as it were with one dash of  
 a sponge at once blotte out all other our euidence of the  
 old Testament: wherein if euer elles wheare, M.  
 Doorman hath showed his notable discretion, muche  
 knowlege in diuinitie, but most of all in law, & lawlike  
 handling of his matiers. For this answer, (as it were  
 a shoue, seruing for al sorte) wil serue al turnes at once,  
 hauinge besides other poinces, no small commoditie, of  
 ease also. Let vs alleage therfore what we list out of the  
 old Testament, though moſte manifestt exampls a-  
 gainst the ignoraunce of Coddes worde, whiche than  
 was, and now is in Priestes, and against their vn-  
 true doctrines, Idolatries, couetousnesse, uncleane-  
 lines, and other euell example of life. Let vs againe  
 alleage the exampls of godly Kinges, dealinge in  
 matiers of Religion, admonishinge, commaundinge,  
 instructinge of Priestes in their duetic, punishinge,  
 depriuinge of them, not doinge their duetic: exam-  
 ples of Priestes mariages, and honour giuen to the  
 viues, and widowes of Priestes, aboute others, or any  
 other

Hofius fol. 86. b.  
 hath the same.

other example in the ould Testament, either condemne  
 ning any vice by our Priestes vsed, or commendinge a  
 ny thing by them now forbidden: the answer is here  
 streight readie framed, in M. Dozmans booke. These be ex-  
 amples good Readers which the aduersaries of the truth bring for  
 the mainteinaunce of the contrarie, out of the old Testament; which  
 manner of reasoninge, if it were lausfull to follow in all pointes; in  
 these daies, what an huge numbre of inconueniēces, might thereupon  
 be grouded, any mā but meanly exercised in the scriptures, may ea-  
 sily conceiue. These are M. Dozmans wordes; what needeth he thā, or any other such, thus to bere their heades  
 about other deuises, this one will serue for all.

But now on the contrary parte, concerning the su-  
 premacie of the Poye, you haue a manifest example in  
 Aaron the high Prieste, saith M. Dozman: and for his  
 tempoꝛall rule, as well as spirituall, you haue a mani-  
 fest example in Moses saith D. Hardinge: but for godly  
 Princes there is no Moses, nor Aaron, nor any other.  
 And though not for Priests wines, yet for their tithes,  
 the examples of the ould Testament are sure and mani-  
 fest. Likewise candels, lampes, torches light, though it  
 be at midday, Aaronicall habite for the Poye, Leuiti-  
 call vestimentes for Priestes and Deacons, incense, aul-  
 ters, belles, banners, gould, siluer, precious stone, and  
 suche like outwarde ceremonies, and ornaments, to be  
 in the seratce of God: you shall in Leuiticus, and other  
 bookes, of the ould Testament, finde stozze of examples  
 for all these abundantly: for (saith M. Dozman,) in that  
 people, in their law, and riesthood, God hath shadowed vnto vs,  
 like a cunninge workeman the whole forme and proportion of his  
 churche etc. And it was so in the shadowe; therefore it must be so  
 in the bodie, and truth, signified by that shadowe. By these and  
 such

Dorman supra  
 fol. 7. 8. 18. &c.  
 Harding. Cōfut.  
 Apol. fol. 305.

such like wordes can **M. Dozman** inforce a necessitie of Dorm. fol. 7. b.  
 the examples of the ould Testament, and whole platte  
 forme of that law to be solowed, whan it pleaseth him.  
 But whan any thinge contrarie to his minde shalbe  
 alleaged out of the ould Testament, than he affir-  
 meth, that by suche manner of reasoninge, from the examples of  
 the olde Testament to our times by vs vsed, any man but meanly  
 exercised in the scriptures, may easely conceiue what a huge num-  
 bre of inconueniences might be brought in: and that therefore it  
 may not be vsed in all pointes: Now god **M. Dozman**, is this  
 that eauen dealinge with vs, that ye talke of? And in  
 what pointes may I pray you, suche manner of reason-  
 inge be vsed: and in what pointes not? You will make  
 curtesie (I knowe) to be plaine herein, but any man,  
 but of meane witte, and but meanely exercised in your  
 manner of dealinge, may easely vnderstande, that  
 this manner of reasoninge is to be vsed, when it ser-  
 ueth your Hope, and his Papistes turne: but whan it  
 doeth not serue their turne, and specially if it make a-  
 gainst their grosse ignoraunce, their abominable ido-  
 latric, tyrannie, and wickednes, and for the authori-  
 tie of godly Princes in the redresse of the same: than  
 suche manner of reasoninge bringeth in an huge nombre of incon-  
 ueniences againste your holy Romishe Church. This  
 is your manner of reasoninge, & these be your pointes  
**M. Dozman**, as to all the whole worlde can not be but  
 most manifest.

But **M. Dozman** will also proue to vs by certaine  
 instances, that suche manner of reasoninge from the  
 examples of the ould Testament to our times, may  
 not in all pointes be vsed: as you shall heare.

¶ **M. Dozman.**

Dorman. Folio. 37.

Hofius lib. 2. fol.  
66. Miracula, &  
max. veteris test.  
admiranda, non  
ad exemplum  
trahenda.

If the miracles, examples significant, and singular privileges, done, practised and graunted in that age, might without any daunger, as well be to the present estate of the Church which now is, drawn, applied and accomodate, as the morall preceptes of that la we may and ar: which haue not then the Kinges now a daies, as many wiues as had Kinge Dauid then?

Norwell.

Hofius lib. 2.  
fol. 66.

This answere you bozowed of Hofius: he cōfesseth he had it out of the Canon lawe, how much y fitter it is for you. But sir, not miracles noz singular priuileges, but ordinarie and vsuall good actes and deedes, suche as are the corrections and remouinges of wicked Priestes by godly Princes, are to be accomodate and applied to our time: for godly Princes so to correct or remoue wicked Priestes, is to agreable to naturall reason, to be a miracle: and to vsuall to be a singular priuilege. Now why had not kinges now a daies as many wiues, as had King Dauid then? inquiteth M. Dorman. This is a soze point I assure you, and a question inuented of a profound intelligence in the Scriptures. For soth M. Dorman, for y our Saufour Chzist hath expresly in the nue Testamēt declared that it is his holy will, that Partage emongst his seruauntes the Chzistians, should be reduced to the first origine, instituted by his heauenly father in Paradise, & that they should be tow in one fleshe, as were Adam and Eue, the first married cople: therefore such examples of many wiues can take no place emongst Chzistians. Wherefoze if you can either shoue any originall ordinaunces, that godly Princes may not medle with Religion, as I haue showed you y originallie one man  
had

Matth. 19.

had but one wife: or againe, if you can shewe me any restraint made in the new Testament, & Christian Princes may not deale in Religion, though the godly Princes, of the old lawe did, as I haue shewed you a restraint, that Christians may not haue many wiues, though Kinges, and some Patriarkes of the old lawe had: or if you can shewe me so many examples of godly Christian Princes, that haue had many wiues at once, as I haue, and will shewe you examples, of godly Christian Princes, that haue dealt in matters of Religion, than M. Doorman might your question seeme to haue bene to some purpose: but beinge as it is, it is the matter for you to demaunde. And because you are questioninge about Marriage, I woulde aske you one question also touchinge the same. Seeinge that Priestes mariages, are both by the doctrine, and examples, of all the godly Priestes, of the old lawe allowed, and in the new Testament, not onely not restrained, but expressly approued, by declaration of the godly wise and children that a Priest should haue: why haue you Papistes condemned the marriage of Priestes, by God, both in the old lawe, and new Testament allowed: and by enforced vowes of calibate, which you call chastitie, haue compelled them to liue so vnchastly and abominable, as to the world is too well knowne? And why you forsaking wiues permitted to Priestes in the old Testament, reteine tithes for the mainteining of their wiues and children appointed in the old Testament?

*Dorman. Fol. 37.*

*Why should it not be as lawfull for the Clergie (I will not onely say to admonish and reprehende) to put Kinges doing amisse at this*

time to death, as it was at that for Samuelt to cut in pieces with  
his owne handes, the body of Agag kinge of Amalech: 1. Reg. 15.

No well.

Concerninge admonishinge or reprehendinge of  
Princes as well as others dwinge amisse by Goddes  
woorde, all our sermons and writings do testifie,  
that we acknowledge it to be lafull: and therefore that  
parenthesis, put in by M. Dozman, to beate the people  
in hande, that we exempted Princes offendinge, from  
all admonition, and reprehension: as it is very leude,  
so is it more malitious, than leude. Now where King  
Agag was an Heathen, an enemye to God, and his  
people, and an expresse commaundement, was giuen  
from God, that he shoulde be slaine: what similitude  
or likenes, can there be betweene him and our Christian  
Princes, whome to honour, and not to murder, our  
Priesttes, and all men, haue a commaundement, that M.  
Dozman should deuise vs such leude questions hereof?  
As though it were as vnlafull for our Christian  
Princes, by the vsuall, effectuall, and most likely exam-  
ples of ould godly Kinges, to intermedle in matters of  
Religion: as it is vnlafull for our Priesttes, to mar-  
rage Christian Princes, (whome they are commaun-  
ded to honour) vppon the warrant of that moste vn-  
likely likelhood of Samuelt, killinge a wicked Kinge,  
haulinge a speciall warrant of God so to do.

Dorman. Fol. 37.

Why not for them to depose Kinges, as well as Kinges to deprive  
them? For if they bring to vs the example of Salomon, who deposed  
Abiathar.

*Abiathar the Priest, and placed sador in his youme, they shall heare  
of vs againe, that samuel by Gods or vnc commaundement pronoun-  
ced Saul deprived of his kingdome, and settled David in the same.*

Reg. 15.  
.16.

Nowell.

Sir your Pope, who hath deposed so many Kinges,  
and Emperours, taketh it to be lawfull for him so to  
do. And surely you do showe your selfe a very reasona-  
ble man, that you wil haue it to be like lausful, for Prin-  
ces to depose Popes, as Popes to depose Princes. I  
praise God we may one day see the erequitiō of the one,  
as they haue of lōg practised the other: lawfullie or vn-  
lawfullie, it shall I trust, appeare plainly to the world,  
to the publike detestation of their vsurped tyranny, and  
of your falshood in mainteining the same. But sir, why  
your Pope may not depose Princes vpon the warrant  
of Samuels example, as Princes may Popes and other  
Prestes, by the example of Salomon, there are many cau-  
ses. First it is a false surmise of you that these exam-  
ples be like: for Samuel deposed not Saule: but onely  
declareth to him Gods sentēce, of his deposition, whiche  
should shortly take effect: neither settled he David (as  
you fable) in the kingdome, as Salomō settled Sadock,  
in the high priesthood: for during all King Saules life,  
after Samuels death, David liued in great feare, and  
trouble, and fled from the face of Saule, and acknow-  
leged him to be his Lozde, and King. Samuel onely a-  
nointed David to be King, and to reigne after Saules  
death: and for that, and whatsoever els he did therein,  
he had a spectall commission and expresse commaunde-  
ment of God theretofore.

1. Regum. 15.

1. Reg. 18. &c.

19. &c.

1. Reg. 16.

Howe make your argument D. Dozman: Samuell

3. declared.

1. Reg. 15. f. 28.

1. Reg. 16.

declared to King Saule Gods determination, that he should be depriued of his kingdome, and that an other better than he should haue it, and so he anointed Dauid: and all this he had Gods expresse & special commaundement to do. Ergo the Pope may depose Christian Princes, if they offende him, hauing not only no commaundement of God therfore, but Gods expresse commaundement being giuen to all the Clergie to the contrary: to witte, that they shuld honour & obey Princes, yea though they were Heathens, and vnrightheous tyrantes: and that they shuld not vsurpe any such supertorritie ouer any men, much lesse ouer Princes, least of all ouer godly Princes, their soueraignes: so farre of is it, that they haue any commission or commaundement special, or general, to depose Christian Princes. And such is, and very wel may be, M. Dozmas reason. But ours is this. King Solomō vpon iust cause deposed Abiathar the high Priest: Ergo. A godly Christian Prince vpon iust cause, may depriue a Bishop or Priest. And sure I am, that M. Dozman & all Papistes with him, can not show a restraint, in the nue Testament, why Princes may not solowe Solomons example herein: as I haue showed a restraint, y priestes may not depose Princes, besides the euident impertinēce of Samuels example dealing with Saule to any suche purpose, as is manifestlie befoze declared.

Dorman. Fol. 38.

*Princes being a priest killed with his dagger the Israélite and Num. 25 the Madianite as thei filthely abused them selues: and haue priests therefore at this day thincke we like iurisdiction? Or would God (is it likely) praise him for the doing that would no we doe the like, as he then did him?*

Nowell

Nowell

That the example of Phinees can not serue our Priests, for authoritie to murther wicked doers: as the examples of ould godly Kinges, deposing wicked Priestes, or dealing in matters of Religion, may serue our Princes, is too euident. For first there is a general comaundement of God, restraining all men from murther: the whiche general comaundement, and not the one priuate example of Phinees, all Priestes and men are bounden to obey. For the special warrant, which God gaue Phinees to murther those wicked doers, serueth him onely, and no other Priestes or me besides him: wherefore the generall Law of not killing, bindeth all men still. Nowe let M. Dorman shewe me likewise a generall comaundement, forbidding all Princes to intermedle in matters of Religion, or to depose a Priest being wilfully wicked: and than I will graunt that the ould Kinges did intermedle in Religion, and depose the high Priest, by a speciall dispensation, & that then their example, is no more warraunt for our Princes to do the like, than is Phinees example for Priestes to comit murther. But M. Dorman and all Papistes are not hable to shewe any such matter. Wherefore Phinees dagger murtheringe the wicked, doth no more hinder our cause, than M. Dorman's wooden dagger (whan he is in his ruffe) is hable to pearce through an alman riuet, or cozselet.

Dorman: Fol 38.

No no good readers, they treade not vprightly that so interpret the scriptures. And thus you see howe generally all these examples and auctorities, being euen after this sort answered, make

A REPROVVE OF M.

make no more for Kinges to rule in matters of religion, then other places doo for the cleargie to depose Kinges, or to kill them, or other doing amisse.

No well.

**M.** Mercifull God, who would beleaue that these Papistes were so blinde, or so impudent as to publishe suche thinges as these, to the face of the world, or as **M. Dozman** speaketh, to bring suche euidence into the face of open Courts? Why **M. Dozman** do they treade not by right, that do teache that your Pope may depose Kinges? How surely than haue all Papistes treaden awrye a great while, whiche haue so taught: and your Pope also, whiche hath so done: and al Christendom hath cause to curse you both, that haue gone no more by right. Againe do our places good **M. Dozman**, by this your generall answer serue as well for Princes to rule in matters of Religion, as the other places serue for the cleargie to depose Princes? How surely I do require no more of you, for a generall answer. And I do pray you, y (as Mendacē memorem esse oportet) you will not forget this, when we come to your particular answers, but that alwaies generallie and particularlie, it may be as lafull for Princes to rule in matters of Religion, and to depose Popes, and all other Priests: as your Pope hath a great while taken it as lawfull for him, to depose Princes. And I trust some practise may solowe of this speculation shortly. But nowe whereas **M. Dozman** wold proue our reasoning from examples of the old Lawe to our time to be absurde and vnreasonable, for that some absurde thinges may likewise be gathered by other examples of the same. I would his  
maister

maister D. Harding should not bring vs in the Popes D. Hard. Cōfut. Apolo. fol. 305.  
 both Tempozal kingdome and Spiritual priesthood, by  
 theramples of Moses, taken out of the ould Lawe. And  
 that D. Dozman should not bring vs in his Pope to be  
 onely high Priest in Christes Church, with all his Aa-  
 ronical habire, Altars, Incēce, Candles, and other Ce-  
 remonies, by the examles of the ould Law: soz that, by  
 the like reason, they may as well bring vs in offeringe  
 of Calues, Bullockes, and sheepe, into Christes Church  
 by the examles of the ould Law: and so, as they haue  
 already made vs halfe Iues of Christiās, to go thzough  
 with the matter, & to make vs whole & perfect Iues in  
 all poinctes. But thus it is good Reader: every singular  
 example of thould Lawe & Testament, so it serue their  
 turne, is authētical & effectual, *than God like a cūning woor-*  
*keman shadowed out vnto vs the whole forme and proportiō of his*  
*Church in that people and in their lawe. For thus speaketh D.*  
*Dozman than, & treadeth vpzightly. But be the exāples*  
*neuer so many, so plaine, so vsuall, so effectuall, if they*  
*sound against them: than may any man but meanly exercised in*  
*the holy scriptures easely conceiue how huge a numbre of inconuen-*  
*niences might be brought in, if it be lawfull to folow such manner*  
*of reasoning from the examles of that age, at these daies in all*  
*poinctes. Thus speaketh D. Dozman now: and saith, we*  
 treade not vpzightly. The end, and final intent hereof  
 (as any but meanly exercised in the practise of Papistes  
 may easely conceiue) is this: to alleage suche poinctes &  
 examles, as like them in the ould Testament soz au-  
 thozitie, is vpzight treading: to bring in, or alleage any  
 other, is to treade awzie. And this is the vpzight trea-  
 ding of these wzie walking croked crabbes. I knowe I  
 haue heretofore good Reader, vpon occasion vsed the  
 By like

like declaration of their dealing. But I pray the seing  
 M. Dozman doth so often times repeat the same deu-  
 ses, suffice me, for the simplicer sortes sake (though with  
 tediousnes to the) by ofte answering thinges often ob-  
 sected, to serue their turne, lest by oblivion, or simple-  
 nes, they take them to their hurt, to be not onely not an-  
 swered, but at all not answerable.

Dorman. Fol. 38.

But to descend nowe more particularly to the severall examina-  
 tion of these examples. I would gladly aske this question of some of  
 these our newe Rabbines, that being graunted to them by the waye  
 of reasoning whiche they presuppose, that is, that king David entre-  
 medled in thaffaires of religion, howe this argument holdeth not  
 withstanding: David being both a king and a Prophet had the rule  
 of religion. Therefore the kinges of our time must haue the like. And  
 in dede thus must they reason, if they will reason trulie. For so was  
 king David they can not all denie it. And as wel am I able to proue,  
 that if he had any suche power it was because he was a prophet, and  
 not in respect of his kingdome, as they shall euer be, to proue the con-  
 trary. So that to make this reason of theirs haue, yea seeme to haue,  
 some aparence of trulie, of two thinges must they nedes doe one, that  
 is either proue our kinges nowe a daies prophetes also, or David in  
 his daies to haue bine but a king simply.

D. Harding al-  
 leageth the same  
 Confut. Apolo.  
 fol. 306. a.

Nowell.

M. Dozman, fearing that in framing one answeare  
 to all our examples of the ould Testament, and so lea-  
 uing the matter, he might seme too much to folowe the  
 vnconninge Cobbelar making one shoue for all sortes  
 of fete, here to show him self somewhat Rabbine like,  
 descendeth to his particularittes. And first doubtinge  
 lest

lest the manifold doings of King Dauid, Solomon, Ezechias, and other godlie Princes in matters of Religion, and their authoritie ouer the Priestes, so euidentlie appearing in the Scriptures, could not be hid, is contented by the way of reasoning, to graunte it: for the whiche liberalitie we haue right good cause to thanke hym. And as he before soze encombrd with Moses example, sometime affirmeth him to haue bene a Priest, sometime is content to put the case he were no Priest: so likewise he lightly passinge ouer, or rather whole dissemblinge the manifold and most effectuoues dealing of King Dauid, in matters of Religion, and making a ridiculous reason of singing men, plaiers, and porters, by no man, but him selfe only, out of his authour Horatius mentioned, to make him selfe merie, he derideth whan he hath done, suche straunge Logique of his own: and so concludeth that King Dauid had nothinge to do in matters of Religion: but nowe consideringe belike, that suche talking about singers, plaiers, and porters, can not put out of discrete mens mindes the notozious rare, and diligent dealing of King Dauid in matters of Religion, and his ordering, governing, and ruling of Priestes, of the same liberalitie, that he before put the case that Moses were no Priest, after he had by longe debating gone about to proue him a Priest, he is contented to graunt to vs nowe also *by the way of reasoninge* that King Dauid intermedled in the affaires of Religion, which before he denied, & did laugh very loude, at suche way of reasoninge: yea and he frameth to vs also the same answaere, for Kinge Dauid in this case, that he did before for Moses in the like case. For as he affirmed before that Moses intermedled in Religion, not as Prince, but as Priest: so doth he nowe sape, that King

D. Hard. Confu.  
fo. 105. a. & 106. a

Dauid intermedled in matters of Religion, not as King but as a prophet. And the same answere as to Moses, so also to King Dauid hath his maister D. Harding. And truthe it is, that King Dauid was both Prophet, and King: and he did write Psalmes, and foreshewd our Saviour Christ, and many other thinges, as a Prophet rather than as a King. But that M. Dozman is so sure, that he is as hable to proue that King Dauid toke care of Religion, and dealt therein as a Prophet, as we are hable to proue that he did it as a godly Kinge, is but a doze and a bragge, seing he doth bring no euidence into the face of open Court, for the proufe thereof, as he promised he would. For that King Dauid did those thinges as a good & godly Prince, and by no special priuilege of his prophete, appeareth evidently hereby. First that he being a Prophet, befoze he was established in the Kingdome, did not yet intermedle in these thinges, vntill he was settled in the Kingdome. Secondly, it appeareth also hereby, for that none of the Prophetes beinge not Kinges, did the like thinges, or vsed the like authoritie, as I haue out of h scriptures declared, that King Dauid did vse: which sheweth that he vsed suche authoritie as a King, & not as a Prophet. Thirdly, it appeareth most evidently by this, that Iosaphat, Iosias, Ioaas, and Iehu, Kinges, and no Prophetes, did the like in the old Law, as did King Dauid: and Constantinus, Valentinianus, Theodosius, and Iustinianus, Emperours, and no Prophetes, did the like in Christian Religion: as partly hath bene already, and shalbe hereafter moze largely and plainely declared. Wherefoze our reason standeth firme. King Dauid as a good and godly Kinge, did intermedle in matters of Religion: Ergo, our Christian Kinges may doo the like.

Neither

Neither is there any cause in this pointe, why we should proue either Kinge Dauid no prophete, or our Kinges now a daies prophetes, seinge all histories Ecclesiastical doe testifie, that godly Kinges, no prophetes, in the best times and ages of the Church, did deale in matters of Religion, and were superiours to Priestes, as farre, and muche, as we doe auouche, that our Christian Princes now a daies may doe.

Dorman. Fol. 38.

In Salomon also, is the case true we ye all so cleare as they make it? For touchinge the deprivation of Abiathar the Priest, to that I answer, that as in breakinge the wicked packe of Adonias, Abiathar, and other their complices, who had conspired to haue put Salomon beside his kingdome: he vsed the counsell of Sadoc and Nathanael to defeat them: so vsed he their auctoritie and ministry to punish them. Nor is forceth not, that the scripture saith. Eiecit ergo Salomon Abiathar vt non esset sacerdos domini, therefore cast Salomon Abiathar out, that he should no longer be our lordes Priest, as though that therefore it were his owne deede, and could be done by no other, seinge that that is a phrase of speache common not in the scriptures onely, but in common talcke also: as if for example a man should say, that Quene Mary (whose soule God assoile) deprived Thomas Crammer of the archebishopricke of Cantorburie (whose reason also against her was no lesse then that of Abiathar against Salomon) he should not say amisse. And yet was not she God nor the chiefe doer thereof, but an instrument ioininge with the Pope in the execution of his determination; touchinge the rooting out of that wicked membre. so saie we in like maner that the Prince hath made such a man Bishop, when in very deede he onely commended him by his letters or woorde, leauinge the free electio. nor withstandinge to them, to whom of right it apperteineth, as this placinge of Sadoc in Abiathars office may welbe vnderstande.

D. Harding. Cōf. fut. Apol. fol. 306. a. hath the same answer to this place of the Apologie.

Hosius lib. 2. fol. 96. a. Reges potestati eligunt episcopos regni.

No Well.

Were it as *M. Dozman* saith, that kinge *Solomon* vsed the coucell of *Sadock* & *Pathan* in the deposing of *Abiathar* the high Priest: what doeth that make more against *Solomons* chiefe authoritie therein, than it maketh against the authoritie of a kinge, that he vseth the aduise of his counsell: But *M. Dozman* goeth about to make a cleare matter obscure, and darke. For that *Solomon* vsed the counsell of *Sadocke* in the breakinge of the wicked packe of *Adonias*, and *Abiathar* the highe Priest, doeth appeare no where in the Scriptures, but it is onely *M. Dozmans* dreame, for God had indued *Solomon* with wisdome enough to know that such a traitour to him, was not to be suffered to remaine high Priest: whiche thinge a Prince of meane wisdome may well vnderstande. And it is not onely besides all testimonye of the Scriptures, but also beside all honestie, to deuise, that *Sadocke* so vertuous a Priest, should be counsellor to *Solomon*, that *Abiathar* the high Prieste should be depriued, & him selfe placed in his place. But this is the historie in the Scripture.

1. Reg. 3.

When *Abiathar* the high Priest, *Joab* y<sup>e</sup> graund Captaine, with others had conspired priuillie to *Adonias*, to make him king: *Pathan* the prophet, cometh to *Bethsabe*, *Solomons* mother, counsellinge her to gene king *Dauid* intellige hereof, & him selfe also cometh in to y<sup>e</sup> kinge streight after her, to assist, and helpe her. *Dauid* the kinge vnderstandinge hereof, commaunded *Sadocke* the Priest to come to him, and charged him, & *Pathan* the Prophet, and *Benasam* the sonne of *Joia*, to anoint *Solomon* his sonne king: which they obediently did. And more than this, that *Solomon* vsed y<sup>e</sup> counsell  
of

of either Pathan, or Sadocke the Priest, in y<sup>e</sup> breakinge of y<sup>e</sup> wicked packe, or in deposinge of Abiathar the high Priest, is not to be founde in y<sup>e</sup> Scripture. Pay in that long. 2. chapter of the thirde of Kinges, where it is declared that Solomō depriued Abiathar y<sup>e</sup> high Priest, & did many other notable thinges, there is not one worde of either Sadocke or Pathan: nor they as much as once named: but onely this is recozded, that Dauid his father after godly counsell geue to his sonne Solomon, of obedience to God, and of certaine other matiers, knowing his sonne to be a wise man, exhorted him to doe in those, & other matiers, according to the wisdome whiche God had geuen him: and other counsell than this, that Salomon had to depose Abiathar the high Priest, is not to be founde in the Scriptures, I am sure. Wherefore all that commentarie vpon the wordes, *Eiecit ergo Solomon Abiathar vt non esset sacerdos Domini.* Is but M. Dozmans dreaminge glose, cleane contrary to the texte. I meruaile that M. Dozman doeth not say that Sadocke gaue Solomon counsel to make him high priest also, as wel as to depose Abiathar, for so he might make, that godly Priest Sadocke, more like his ambitious Popes, which many waies procure not onely y<sup>e</sup> deposition, but also the destruction of their prædecessours, to make the selves a rowme. But I pray you marke M. Dozman his phrase of speach in this case, *Solomon vsed the authoritie and ministerie of Sadocke the Priest, and Nathan the Prophete, in deposinge of Abiathar the highe Priest.* Authoritie and ministerie both at once M. Dozman: and take you here authoritie, for counsell, or simplie as it soundeth, or craftely to deceiue the simple, or leudlie that you wisse not what you saide? For I assure you we had more néede of your commentarie here, than in

Eiecit

Eiecit Solomon Abiathar, a great deale: as also in the  
 processe will moze appeare. Your example whiche you  
 vse for declaration, how Solomon deposed Abiathar is  
 very pretie: as it appeareth you learned it of your ma-  
 sters notes, or talke, before he printed it, vnlesse you  
 will say, that he learned it of you: for he likewise vseth  
 the same. And seinge Hostius who is very briefe, and too  
 briefe in answeringe to this notable ancient example  
 of our Kinge Solomon. Your maister and you doe well  
 to answer it by commune talke, and by a newe example  
 of Quene Marie thus: as Quene Marie deprived Thomas  
 Cranmer and yet was she God worthe not the chiefe doer thereof,  
 but an instrument, ioyninge with the Pope in the exequution of his  
 determination &c. you shoulde not here haue made the  
 instrument so ioint selowe: but shoulde haue spoken  
 plainly as afoze you did, that the Pope vsed her authoritie  
 and ministerie, that we might haue knowen in whome  
 had bene the authoritie, in whome the ministerie, in  
 the Pope or in the Quene. But doeth this glose make  
 plaine the text, or is it not rather vtterly contrary to it,  
 and subuerteth it. For who was deposed by Solomon:  
 Abiathar: who was Abiathar: the high Priest of all  
 amongst the Iues, the very figure and funder of the  
 Popes supremacie: who was deposed by Quene Ma-  
 rie: Thomas Cranmer: who was he: not the high  
 Priest of all, as was Abiathar, (I am sure by M. Doz-  
 mans law, or diuinitie) but one of the Metropolitanes  
 of one Iland. Further, by whose counsell deposed Solo-  
 mon Abiathar: by Sadocke and Athans counsell: (saith  
 M. Dorman, but the Scripture saith not so) who were  
 they: the high Priests of all: No: I trow, vnlesse there  
 were two or thre high Priests together: but Sadocke  
 was

D. Hard. Cōfut.  
 Apol. 306. 2.

was one of the Priestes, inferiour to the high Priest Abiathar, and Pathan was a godlie, but a poore prophete. Why, and may a Kinge by the aduise of godly inferiour Priestes depose the high Priest of all? Surely hetherto hath M. Dozman brought the case. If you woulde therefore haue reasoned a simili in dæde, you should thus haue gone to worke M. Dozman. As Solomon, by the aduise of Sadocke and Pathan godly inferiour ministers, deposed Abiathar the high Priest: so should Quene Marie, by the aduise of Thomas Cranmer, and other godly Bishoppes, haue put downe the Pope. And would to God that, y noble Ladie Quene Marie, and all other Christian Princes had bene well perswaded, that she with their helpe might haue so done to that traytour of all Kinges, & Kingdomes the Pope: as did Solomon to Abiathar the high Priest. traitour to him, and his kingdom: & than might M. Dozman haue taken a true similitude from Solomon to her: for surely as M. Dozman hath now framed it, it agreth like Germanes lippes, euery part sarring from other. On the one part the highest Priest is deposed: on the other he that is deposed, is not the highest Priest. On the one parte the inferiour Priestes giue counsell to the Kinge (for so M. Dozman will haue it) y the highest Priest of al should be deposed: on the other the highest Priest of al, y Pope, commaundeth the Quene that an inferiour be depriued. And which is the chiefe pithe of the matier in dæde, on the one parte appeareth at large, vnder bull of lead for moze suretie, that it was the Popes will that Quene Marie should see Thomas Cranmer depriued: but that Sadocke or Pathan gaue counsell to Solomon that he should depose Abiathar appeareth neither by writinge,

Sub plumb.

noꝛ by any seale, as much as of iwar: noꝛ by any matier,  
 noꝛ any woꝛde of recoꝛde at all. And if it did, it shoulde  
 yet solow thereof, that Pꝛinces with the aduise of their  
 infertour godly Cleargie, may depꝛiue both higher  
 pꝛelates: yea & the Pope him selfe y highest of al. Which  
 I beleue M. Doꝛman his Canon lawe, soꝛbidding any  
 man to be so boulo, as to repꝛoue a Pope be he neuer so  
 wicked, will not well allow, although he haue by his di  
 uinitie bꝛought vs the readie way thereunto: which yet  
 I wott not how it soundeth somewhat against that su  
 pꝛemacie of the Pope, which is M. Doꝛmans pꝛesent &  
 pꝛincipall pꝛoposition. And thus you that are desirous  
 to learne to frame Similitudes, so that they may soꝛne  
 smothly, and closely to your purpose, and to make it to  
 be well vnderstanded, (soꝛ so M. Doꝛman in his conclu  
 sion of this place pꝛofesseth) and withall, woulde know  
 how to bꝛinge your treatie direaly to your intended co  
 clusion, you haue M. Doꝛman a learned Lawier, and  
 deepe Diuine to resoꝛte vnto, soꝛ that purpose.

Touchinge the other phꝛase y we say: *the Prince hath  
 made such a man Bis hop, when in very deede he onely comended him  
 by his letters leauing the free election nor withstandinge to them, to  
 whome of right it apperteineth, and that so this placing of Sadock  
 in Abiathars office may well be vnderstanded, saith he. It is true,  
 as Chimera est in intellectu, it may be so vnderstan  
 ded, if one will: but vntill you shawe that Sadocke and  
 Pathā dealed in this matier, as your free electours you  
 speake of, do deale in the election of your Bishop, which  
 you shall neuer be hable to do, no man (but suche as  
 your selfe is) can vnderstande, howe these phꝛases are  
 like: oꝛ how the one shoulde make the other plaine.  
 But with papistes al thinges are plaine as a packstaffe*  
 soꝛ.

for the Popes primacie and against Christian Princes prerogative. But touching this free electiō of Bishops y<sup>e</sup> M. Dozman talketh of, Hostius his authour saith thus to Sigismonde Kinge of Polonia. Cuius alius arbitrio præterq̄ tuo, & à Canonicis eliguntur episcopi, &c. *hoi. lib. 2. fol. 76a.* y<sup>e</sup> is to say, By what other mans wil & choise, but yours (he speaketh to the Kinge) are Bishoppes both elect, or chosen by the Canons, & confirmed by the Bishoppe of Rome? Surelie neither do the Canons elect, nor the Pope confirme, but such as you name. These be Hostius wordes, who vpon the same hath made this marginall note. The Kinges of Polonia do chose or elect the Bishoppes of the kingdome. This being thus M. Dozma, your phrase of makinge Bishoppes, will scarce helpe you to keepe Princes from beinge causa sine qua non, or the chiefe in makinge of Bishoppes: and that your election, you talke of is not so free, as you make it, but that the Prince, as the chiefe in the saide election of Bishoppes, as Hostius your authour saith, doeth elect them: and as Princes are the chiefe in the electiō of Bishops, why shoulde they not be the chiefe in the destitution, or depriuing of them: & so in y<sup>e</sup> point be chiefe gouernours ouer persons Ecclesiasticall: Neither can you except to this example of Hostius as the foraigne vse of an other kingedome: for the same right haue the Kinges of England in the electiō of Bishops, as Hostius declareth the Kinges of Polonia to haue. And were the electiō of Bishops diuers, in diuers cōtrets, y<sup>e</sup> proueth such electiōs to stand more vpon mans cōstitutions, which oftē varie, than vpon Goddes law, which is alwaies, & in al places one. Wherefore bothe your phrases of common speache, and common talke, & your exāples of Quēne Marie depriuinge,

and the Prince makinge a Withoppe, are impertinent to your purpose: and yet you vpon the warrant of this your leude commen talbe, are houlde to say: *It forceth not that the scripture saith,* to the contrary, that Salomon put out Abiathar & made Sadocke Priest for him: where in the Scripture vseth none other phrase, than it doeth in this sentence which is soyned. Salomon made Banais captaine ouer his armie in the stæde of Joab: which sentence as it is soyned with the other in the same verse, so is it of the same phrase and meaninge. Now where Mr. Doorman reprocheth that reuerende father & holy martyr of God Thomas Cranmer, as both a traitour to Quene Marie, and a wicked membze, I doubt not but God will auenge the iniurle done to his saintes in his due time. And I would that these men, who so readely obiecte the molte haynous crime of treason to others, would once cease them selves to mainteine that knowe traitour to all Kinges and kingdomes, their Pope. And touchinge Bishop Cranmer, they that be of authoritic, creadite, & experieçe in greatest matters, doe well knowe, how well that reuerende milde father loued Quene Marie, & how earnestly he trauasled with king Henrie the. viij. her father, sometime soze offended with her, beinge lady Marie, for to winne his fauour to her againe: whiche also stode her in god stæde: & how much against his will, and after he had longe resisted, euen to the perill of his life, he was violently caried away with that storme & tempest, which so few of any Religion coulde escape. By the which his inforced fault, so much against his minde, and will, he did nothing like offende against Quene Marie, as did some popish pzelates, who bla-  
 ted the same also abroade to the worlde in their prin-  
 ted

ted booke: of whom some for that they were Papistes, remained not onely alive, and in good estate, but in favour also. Who incensed that myld ladie (by whose clemencie them selues were saued) to high displeasure and rigour (contrary to her good nature) against the said reuerend father, and many other godly and learned Bishops, and others: who for their clemencie vsed in the time of their authoritie, toward the Papistes, were rewarded by them againe (as the gratitude and kindnes of that sect is) with moze cruell death, than is deuised for any traytours, or wicked membres. And yet the Papistes not contented, or satisfied therewith, doe still persecute the said godlie learned men after their death, with all kinde of false sclanders, and vile reproches, most meete for their mouthes, that vtter them, and wel declaring the flame of malice lurking in their hartes, not quenched with their blood: who might be better occupied in the amēdement of suche faultes in their own liues, than in charging of dead men, who can not answer for them selues, with suche crimes, as were rather the commen faultes of those violent times, than those mens peculiar offences.

*Dorman fol. 38.*

*To the example of Ezechias I answer with the scripture, that of*  
*all those thinges here rehearsed, and what so euer els may be, he was*  
*one by the executor, the counsell and ordering thereof, comming al-*  
*waies from Esaias the Prophete: who as the mouthe commaunded*  
*the arme, that is the Prince, to doe and put in execution this or that.*  
*In like manner I answer to the example of Iehu who killed the vic-*  
*ked Prophete, but by the aduertisement and sentence as it were*  
*firste giuen against them, by Hælixus the Prophete, sent to Iehu as*  
*kinge, by him to be put in execution.*

Out of Ho. li. 24.  
fol. 68. a.

Thus also an-  
swereth D. Har.

Confut. Apolo.  
fol. 305. b.

Nowell.

That Kinge Ezechias as well in the Inuasion of his enemies, by whome he was soze oppressed: as also in his greuous and deadly sicknes, was by the Prophet Elisas both counselled, and comforted, no man denieth. That he was also godlie instructed in the Law of God by the saide Prophet we also confesse, as those that euer did graunt, that it is the bonden durtie of Ecclesiasticall ministers, to instructe as well their Princes, as all others, in the knowledge of Gods Lawe. And other wyse of Kinge Ezechias, and Elisas, the Prophet speaketh the Scripture, neither in the booke of Kinges, noz of the Cronicles, noz Ecclesiasticus. For that the saide Kinge had any aduertisement, much lesse authoritie from Elisas, in those his particular actes, by him done in the reformation of Religion, and namelis in the destroyng of the bzasen Serpent, Wh. Doorman can bzinge no one woozde of euidence out of the Scripture into the face of open Courte, as he promised he woulde.

Further, Elisas was not of the lyne oz Roche of the Priestes, oz Leuites, but of the bloud Royall: for Priestes in those daies sozgettinge their durtie, God stirred vp, not onely men of noble birth, but also sheperdes, yea, and women, by the spirit of prophete: as he did Holda in the tyme of Josias, to rebuke, admonishe, and teache, as well the saide Priestes, as also to stirre vp the Kinges and their people, to the true knowledge of God, and right Religion, beinge by the Priestes, either neglected, oz corrupted. And God hath likewyse in our daies, in like ignozaunce, and wickednes of

nes of proude Popishe Priestes declared his holy will to the simple. Concerning the peculiar tyme of King Ezechias, the Scriptures doo teache that Religion was whollie corrupted, and that it was restored, not by the Priestes, but by the godlie Prince Ezechias. <sup>a</sup> For of the Priestes of that time the Scriptures doo testifie, that they were vn sanctified, and could not doe their duttie: and that the King had much adoo to bring them to any goodnes. And therefore the Kinge tooke vppon him to refozme religion, & he called the Priestes and Leuites befoze him, <sup>b</sup> admonisheth them of their duttie, tould them howe they should doo it, appointes euertie of them their office, <sup>c</sup> and commaunded them to doe it, euen as the father doth admonishe & commaunde his childzen: <sup>d</sup> yea, and by expresse name he calleth the saide Priestes and Leuites his childzen. And the saide Priestes and Leuites, did obeie the sayde commaundementes of the Kinge, whiche were agreable to the commaundementes of God.

And the said Ezechias sent Epistles, and godlie exhortations, æquall with Sermons by postes, and curreys, to the ignorant and wicked people. And the people at the saide Kinge Ezechias commaundement, destroyed the wicked altars, where Idolatrie was committed, and cast the rubbish thereof into the brooke Cedron. And, whiche was moſte of all, the said Ezechias also destroyed the braſen Serpent. <sup>e</sup> All these thinges saith the Scripture, did King Ezechias, and God prospered him. But *D. Dorma* saith, al this is but a figure, and phrase of speache. King Ezechias, (saith the Scripture) in all these thinges <sup>f</sup> commaunded the Priestes & Leuites to doo their dutties, and that he had muche

adw

<sup>a</sup> 2. Paral. 29. a.<sup>5.</sup> g. 34. Sacer-

dotes pauci erāt

<sup>2.</sup> Paral. 30. a. 3. c.<sup>15.</sup> d. 22.

Sacerdotes sancti-

ficati nō fuerūt.

Sacerdotes tādē

sanctificati sunt.

<sup>b</sup> 2. Paral. 29.

Audite Leuitas,

sanctificāini. &amp;c.

<sup>c</sup> 2. Paral. 30.

Ezechias iussit,

p̄cepit, &amp; iuxta

mādatū Ezechias

iuxta imperium

eius, &amp;c.

<sup>d</sup> 2. Par. 30. b. 11.

Filij mei nolite

negligere.

<sup>e</sup> 2. Para. 31. d. 20.

Fecit Ezechias,

vniuersa que dixi

mus. &amp;c.

Dor. fol. 39. b.

<sup>f</sup> 2. Paral. 30. a. 3.<sup>5.</sup> c. 15. d. 22.

a do to bring the said Priestes to any goodnes: but M.  
 Dozman saith he was but the arme, and that he did the  
 commaundement of Esias the Prophet: and yet is not  
 M. Dozman habile to bring into the face of the Courte,  
 any one woorde out of the Scriptures, whereby it may  
 appeare that Ezechias was in any one of these particu-  
 lar thinges aduertised by the saide Prophet: muche  
 lasse, that he tooke any authoritie of him, but that he  
 did them onely of his owne godly motiō, and by the au-  
 thoritie, whiche he had of God so to do. But admit yet  
 he were aduertised by Esaias the Prophet in these mat-  
 ters of Religion: doth it folowe that he was the Kings  
 superiour therfore any moze, than it foloweth that  
 Princes consellours aduertising them by good counsel,  
 should therfore be superiours to their Princes. For E-  
 saias was not the highe Priest, to whom M. Dozman  
 giueth al autoritie: but Azarias was y high Priest, who  
 with all other Priestes in all thinges were at the com-  
 maundement of King Ezechias. And if M. Dozman  
 would so haue it, that the Prince by the aduise of infe-  
 rriour godly ministers giuen according to Gods worde,  
 may likewise call before him, instructe, appointe and  
 commaunde the high Priest, and all other Priestes, in  
 all thinges and matters of Religion, accordinge as did  
 King Ezechias, our striffe with him in this point, and  
 many others, shal soone be at a point. For than I trust,  
 that as aulters, whereupon Idolatrie was committed,  
 were subuerted, and that bzalen Serpent, notwithstanding  
 it was set up by Moses, at the commaundement  
 of God, and had continued so many hundred yeres, in  
 the daies of so many godly kings and holy Prophetes,  
 and notwithstanding that so many miracles were done  
 before

befoze it, and so manie cured from the venemous, and  
 deadly stings of the fire Serpentes, was yet by the  
 godly king Czechias, onely so; that Idolatrie was co-  
 mitted vnto it, vtterly destroyed, and that by the aduise  
 of Esaias (saith M. Dozman) I trust, he will likewise  
 allowe, that our Christian Princes, by the counsell of  
 their ministers, though inferiours in woꝛldly estate,  
 yet aduertising them according to Gods woꝛde, may  
 likewise destrose Popishe altars, & ouelish Images,  
 by no Poles, noꝛ man of Gods els, by no comaundemēt  
 of God, but cleane contrarie to Gods expresse comaun-  
 dement, set vp by the Deuill him selfe, and his mēbꝛes:  
 and befoze the whiche no miracles haue euer bene  
 wꝛought, but either by the operation of Sathan, oꝛ fel-  
 ned, as wꝛought, by Popishe fables: but moze abomina-  
 ble Idolatrie hath there bene wꝛought befoze them, and  
 vpon their altars, thā euer was befoze the brazen Ser-  
 pent, and vpon the altars whiche King Czechias de-  
 stꝛoed. Nowe concerning Iehu, though Elisæus, by 4. Reg. 9.  
 one of the children of the Prophetes, did anointe him  
 King, and gaue him knowledge of Gods will, touching  
 the destruction of wicked King Achabbes seede: yet can  
 not M. Dozman shewe out of the Scriptures, as much  
 as one woꝛd, that Elisæus should counsell him to kill  
 the wicked Prophetes, but that he did it of his owne  
 godly seruent zeale: and if he could proue, that it were  
 done by Elisæus counsell, who was no high Priest, but  
 a poore, though a godly Prophet, yet, I thinke M. Doz-  
 man would be loth to graunt, that Christian Princes  
 may vpon like aduertisement, kill all the wicked Baa-  
 lites of our time, the Idolatrous Popishe Priestes.

Nowe wheare as both D. Hardinge, and M. Dozman

Harding. cōfut. **Do not onely make the same answer to the example of**  
 Apolog. 306. **king Ezechias, but also to the ende thereof do toyne li-**  
**ketwise the example of Zehu, with the answer to the**  
**same, being ther to nothing occasioned by the Apologie:**  
**it may appeare thereby, besydes many other euident**  
**tokens, that they to we do vse the same instructions.**

Dorman. Fol. 39.

Ho. li. 1. fol. 61. **Howe Iosias warned the Priesies of their office and duetie, it**  
 D. Hard. Confu. **appeareth in the fourth booke of the Kinges, where he required** Cap. 23  
 Apolog. fo. 307. **the priesies to demaunde at Goddes handes counsell, what he and**  
**his people should doo: so that whatsoeuer he did also, he can be coun-**  
**red no otherwise to haue doen, but as a minister, vpon the aduertise-**  
**ment and relation of the priesies.**

Nowell.

**What an holowe and false dealinge of a craftie**  
**Papist is this? Where the Scripture saith: Et præ-**  
**cepit Iosias Helciae sacerdoti. &c. that is to say, King**  
**Iosias commaunded Helcias the highe Priest, with o-**  
**thers, Priestes and Scribes, to aske counsell at the**  
**Lordes handes, M. Dorman hath translated it: he re-**  
**quired the Priestes &c. lest anie woorde of authoritie**  
**ouer the Priestes, should seeme to be attributed to the**  
**the Prince, and speciallie ouer the highe Priest: for**  
**whiche cause he also hath suppressed Helcias the highe**  
**Priest's name expressely mentioned in the texte: and**  
**hath hid it vnder the commune name of Priestes, as**  
**though Iosias had to do with some meane sorte of**  
**Priestes, and them also, as his superiours belike,**

60R

had

had gentle required: that it shoulde not be knowen to the people, that Kinge Josias gaue any thinge in commaundement to the highe Priest to be done. But that whiche soloweth in *D. Dorman* here, passeth all falsehoode. Wherefoze saith he, *whatsouever king Josias did, he can be counted none other wise to have done, but as a minister vpon the aduertisement and relation of the Priestes.* Here is a smoothe tale forsoothe. But what aduertisement gaue the Priestes from the Lordes mouth, or how came they by it? Thus saith y<sup>e</sup> Scripture. Helcias y<sup>e</sup> high Priest, with the other Priestes and Scribes, (by the comaundement of the king) went to a woman, Holda the Prophetesse of her to learne the Lordes will. The Scripture saith thus: whereby it may appeare that none of the Priestes in those daies knew it th<sup>e</sup> selues. Where you befoze said, that Elaias y<sup>e</sup> Prophet comaunded the King Czchias, as the mouth commaundeth the arme, you may here likewise saie of Holda the Prophetesse, that she as the mouth commaunded King Josias as y<sup>e</sup> arme. And what were your Priestes by the Kinge comaunded to goe? Surely they were the secte rather thā the head, or mouth: vnles, for that they went to a woman to learne, and that not of any their owne good wil or motion, but at the godly Kinges commaundement, they must needes be the heades and chiefe doers: onely for that they were Priestes forsooth. And the godlie Kyng, who at the first sight of Gods woozde, was so moued with true repentaunce, and by and by intended a reformation of his, and their liues, and of Religion, according to Gods will, and thereupō sent for y<sup>e</sup> Priestes, commaunded them to enquire at Gods handes: yea and

4. Reg. 22. c. 14.  
Ierūt itaq; Helcias sacerdos & Ahicam, &c. ad Holdā Propheetidem. &c.

4. Re. 22. c. 12. 13.  
Præcepit Rex Helcix sacerdoti & Ahicam, &c. Ite & consulite Dominum super me, & super populo. &c.

4. Reg. 22. c. 11.  
Ibidem. c. 13. &c.

afterward was saue him selfe to warne them of their office, and duetie, and to teache them the same also.

4. Reg. 23. 2. 4.  
Et praecepit Rex  
Helciae pontifici,  
& sacerdotibus  
secundi ordinis  
&c. vt projiceret  
de templo Domini omnia  
vasa Baal.

And he commaunded the said highe Priest, and the other Priestes, to cast out of the temple all the vessels, & instrumentes of Idolatrie, consecrate to the seruice of Baal: he destroyed the altars & Images, whereunto Idolatrie was committed: and he put downe all the Idolatrous Priestes, and throughlie in all pointes reformed Religiō. The Scriptures planely affirming, that Josias commaunded, and did all these thinges, yet must he be but a minister to suche wicked & ignozāt doubtles, as those Priestes were. *D. Dozman*, you should rather, as you befoze said, that *Esaias* as the mouth commaunded *Ezechias* the King as the arme, so here also haue saide, that the woman *Holda* the Prophete, was the mouth, and *Josias* as the King the arme. For here *D. Dozman*, your *Labia sacerdotis*, your Priestes lippes, and mouth failed and missed of the keepinge of true knowledge, contrarie to that, whiche you falsely befoze said, that those lippes had a promisse by the Prophetes, not to misse to kepe true knowlege.

Dor. sup. fo. 18. b  
Aggzi. 2.  
Malach. 2.  
Esa. 28. b. 7.  
Hierom. 2. b. 8.  
& 4. c. 9.  
Ezechiel. 7. g. 26

For now loe, in steade of *Interroga sacerdotes legem. & labia sacerdotis custodient scientiam*, are come in place, *sacerdotes nescierunt me dominū, ignorauerūt iuditiū: tenentes legē nescierunt me, obstupescunt sacerdotes & lex peribit a sacerdote: in steade I say of these textes: Inquire for the Lawe of the Priestes: & the lippes of the Priestes should keape knowlege: which textes were befoze by you vntruly appliēd, are now these textes truly come in place: the Priestes haue not knowen the Lorde, they haue bene ignozant of iudgement, they that held y<sup>e</sup> law, did not know me, (the Lorde) the Priestes shall ware amased, and the Lawe shalbe lost from the Priest.*

These

These I say & such other textes, are here come in place: and now are the Priestes driven to enquire and learne the knowlege of the Lozde, at the lippes and mouth of a woman. And where y<sup>e</sup> Scriptures attribute as much authoritie ouer Kinge Iosias, and these Priestes, the high Priest and all, to the prophete Holda, as they doo to the Prophete Esaias, ouer Kinge Ezechias: therefore by your former reasons, you may conclude, that a woman in these daies, was the chiefe in reformation of Religion, as was in those daies the prophete Esaias. But neither Esaias nor Holda y<sup>e</sup> prophete were high Priestes, therefore were not the high Priestes chiefe in the reformatiō of Religion. But neither can Holda the prophete, for declaring how al things should be done, nor the godly Kinge, for commaunding and seinge all things done accordinge to Goddes will, be the chiefe, but onely ministers in these matters by M. Dormans iudgement: but the Priestes, knowinge nothinge, doinge nothinge of them selves, but onely goinge & asking counsell of a woman, & that not of them selves, but by y<sup>e</sup> Kinges commaundement, and doinge all other things likewise at the said Kinges commaudemēt, as the Scriptures expressly doo declare, must needs be the chiefe mē in doinge of all those things, forsooth. So easie it is for a Priest, be he neuer such an idle, wicked, and doultysh, lubbar, to be the chiefe doer, though he doo nothing, but by the commaundement of the Prince: and so harde, yea and impossible a thinge is it, for a Prince, be he neuer so godly, wise, and diligent, and vse he neuer so muche authoritie, by M. Dorman his iudgement, to be chiefe doer in any mater of Religion or godlines: but he must needs be a minister to such leud maisters, and an arme

A REPROVVE OF M

to be commaunded by suche mouthes, and a fooke to  
 suche folish heades. So with *M. Dozman* to comaund,  
 is the office of the inferiour, & to obey the commaunde-  
 ment, is the office of the chiefe doer: yea and fire is wa-  
 ter, and water fire: so it may serue to auance, leude,  
 ignozant *Priesttes*, aboue godly and wise *Princes*, such  
 as were those *Priesttes*, & that *Prince*. But *M. Dozman*  
 doeth herein right well, and even as he shoulde do: for  
 the moze folithe and ignozant they be, the soner may  
 they be such heades, as were many of his *Popes*, beinge  
 heades boide of all vnderstandinge and wisedome in all  
 thinges appertaininge to God and godlines: beinge in  
 daede vnworthie to be, I will not say, the armes, as *M.*  
*Dozman* speaketh, but the heales, in any god or godly  
 bodie. Wherefore blessed be God, who, as in the igno-  
 rance, of the *Leuiticall Priesttes*, bragginge in their  
 blindnes, that the law shoulde not faile fro the *Priesttes*,  
 sent the *Prophetes* his seruantes, beinge not onely no  
*Priesttes* of the *Leuiticall* tribe, but also poze shepardes  
 and simple women some of them, to teache his holy will  
 vnto his people: so hath he in like ignozance of the  
 proude popish *prelates* and *Priesttes* likewise in their  
 blindnes, bragging of their knowledge and iudgement,  
 called simple shepardes, & other persons of meane æsti-  
 matiõ in this world, euẽ as he did *Amos* the *Prophet*,  
 and *Holda* the *prophetise*, with such other, by such sellie  
 ones, in our daies to instruct his people, to confounde  
 the worldly wisedome, & sterne stoutnes, of such proude  
 popithe *prelates*.

Capita sine sen-  
 sa, & cerebro.

Hierem. 18. c. 18.

Dorman. Fol. 39.

Now as for *Iosophat* and *Ioas*, if the one ouerthrew the wooddes  
 and hilles where the people lurked from the temple, the other  
 warned the *Priesttes* to see better to the reparation of the same: what

Hofius lib. 2.  
 fol. 67. b.

great

greate matter is this I pray you? or howe doeth this proue that  
 kinges ought to haue, the chiefe rule ouer the Church? If Princes  
 that haue byn in times past, had so well looked in this point to their  
 duetie as of right they ought, and all good men wis he they had: if  
 they had scoured your lustkes corners, and ouerthrowen the wooddes,  
 the blinde cellers and rotten barnes, in whiche you firste vityed  
 your paysoned doctrine: neither had that made them rulers of the  
 Church but faithfull and trusty ministers, nor you byn here nowe,  
 to trouble the Church of God as you doo. As if on the other side, they  
 had also folowed the example of Ioas in callinge vpon the repara-  
 tion of Goddes house, neither woulde any good man haue founde  
 faulte there withall, nor any wise mā haue thought, that this should  
 haue made them the chiefe gouernours in Religion: nor finally so  
 many Churches lien at this day flat on the grounde, so many mona-  
 steries in whiche God was serued and the poore relieved, made sta-  
 bles for horses, housen for sheepe, or sties for swine.

No well.

Thus saith the Scripture of Kinge Josophat.

1. Josophat destroyed the hill aultars & groues, where  
 Idolatrie was committed. 2. Paral. 17. 2. 6.  
 Excelsa, & lucos  
 abstulit.

2. In the thirde yere of his raigne he made a visitacion  
 of his people and sent the Priestes & Leuites to preach,  
 and to teach all the people the law of God. Ibidem, b. 7.

3. He refusing the false doctrine of 300. Prophetes of  
 Baall, desired to heare the true Prophete of the Lorde  
 though he were but one, and simple to see two. 2. Paral. 18. b. 6.  
 &c.

4. He yet once againe doeth visite his people, and re-  
 uoked them to the Lorde their God. 2. Paral. 19. 2. 4.

5. He appointed the Priestes & Leuites in Hierusalē  
 their offices, geuing them in comaundement that thus  
 and thus they should do faithfully with a perfect harte  
 in the feare of the Lorde. Ibidem, c. 9.  
 Præcepit eis di-  
 cens sic agatis.  
 &c.

He

D. Harding, C6-  
 fut . 306. b.  
 Trāslate vwoord  
 for woorde out  
 of Hofius lib. 2.  
 fol. 68. b. & 69. a.  
 In lucis, hoc est,  
 in tenebris, in  
 opacis locis, in  
 angulis &c. &  
 lucos ac lucifcos  
 vocat.

6. **He teacheth the Priestes their duetie, and namely**  
 Ibidem. c. 11. **amongst them he appointeth Amarias the high Priest**  
**to his office.**

7. **In time of aduersitie, he commaundeth fasting and**  
 2. Paral. 20. 1. 3. **prayer throughout all his Realme.**

4. &c.

All these circumstances most manifestly declaring Kinge Jehosophat his intermedlinge in matiers of Religion, and chiefe authozitte ouer the Priestes, & name: lie ouer the high Priest him selfe, *W. Dozman* doth dissemble, and passe ouer with these wordes: *Iosophat ouerthrewe the wooddes and hilles where the people lurked from the temple. VVhat great matier is this I pray you?* and this he doeth to make our cause as stronge as may be, like a true man of his promise, you may be sure. And lest the Reader shoulde be occasioned to finde these so many, and so notable examples of the Kinges *Iosias* & *Iosophat*, he hath omitted the notings of the places of the Scriptures, where these histozies of *Jehosophat* and *Iosias* are to be found, whiche he hath alsoe done in no other example.

Touching king *Joas*, *ŷ* Scriptures teach thus of him.

1. **Joas determined to repaire the Temple of *ŷ* Lord,**  
 2. Paral. 24. 2. **and soz that cause he assembled together the Priestes &**  
 4. 5. &c. **Leuites, and gaue them in commaundement that they**  
**shoulde spedely goe there about.**

2. **But the Leuites (to say the Cleargie) were neglig-**  
 4. Reg. 24. **gent thereabout, yea, and abused the money geuen ther-**  
 2. 5. 6. &c. **to by the deuotion of the people, to their owne vse, pro-**  
 3. **fitte, and pleasure. Wherefoze Kinge Joas called soz**

**the high Priest Josada and blamed him, soz that he did**  
**not see the saide Leuites do his commaundementes.**  
 4. **Whereupon the Leuites and Priestes were sozbidden**  
**any moze to medle with *ŷ* money, geuen by the people:**  
 and

and more diligence and circumspection was bled by Jojada the high Priest: and much money was gathered to the repayninge of the Temple, the whiche the Kinge & the high Priest deliuered to y<sup>e</sup> maisters of the woorkes. And the woorkes beinge finished, the reste of the money was brought to the Kinge, who made thereof vesselles for the seruice of the Lozde in the temple.

5.

All this doeth M. Dozman thus expresse: *Ioas warned the Priestes to see better to the reparation of the Temple. vVhat great matier is this I pray you?*

Though this histozie in dede do concerne the repairinge of the outward Temple, yet that the restozinge of true Religion, and suppressinge of false Religion, and Idolatrie, is therein contained, the plaine texte doeth plainely declare, referringe all those doinges to the woordes, and constitution of Moses, and makinge expresse mention, how wicked Athalia had taken away all the ornâmetes of the temple, and garnished therewith the temple of Baall.

2. Paral. 24. b. 6. 9.

And further, that al, as well the buildinge, as repairinge of y<sup>e</sup> temple of Hierusalem, is a continuall figure of the restozing, and mainteininge of true Religion, is by the commune consent of all interpreters testified. Wherefoze Kinge Joas beinge chiefe herein, and rebuking the negligence as well of the high Prieste, as the coueteousnes & abuse of the whole Cleargie, and is nowhere blamed for so taking vpon him, but obeded, euen of y<sup>e</sup> god our father Jojada the high Priest: it geueth a manifest example of the right of Princes in matiers of Religion, & superiortie over the high Priestes & Cleargie. Where M. Dozman folowinge Hosius his authour

Hosius Lib. 2. fol. 68. b. &amp; 69. a.

Bbb

our

our selves in wooddes, blinde cellars, and rotten barnes, as he termeth them in the time of the moste bloudie popishe persecution there to saue our liues, and to serue our God, whiche for feare of moste cruell death, we durst not do openly, to those wicked groues, wherein Idoatrye was comitted amongst the Iues: & would haue had those our lustie corners. (as he calleth them) so scaured that none of vs shoulde now haue bene liuinge to trouble their Romish Church: he sheweth therein, that his charitable gentlenes, which he beareth towardes vs, whereof he spake befoze, protestinge, that *he hateth vs. nothinge, but pitieth vs. very much.* But of our corners in suche case of persecution how so euer Hosius, D. Harding, and D. Dorman do speake, thus do the true histories Ecclesiasticall speake of the like.

Dorman supra.  
fol. 17. b.

Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. 68. 69.  
D. Hard. Cōfut.  
Apol. fol. 106.

Eusebius lib. 10.  
cap. 8.

In the like persecution vled by Licinius the tyrant, & his Infidelles against Christiās, as was by the Pope & his Papisles lately erequuted against vs: Eusebius, after he had declared howe holy Bishoppes, and other learned godly men, were, as though thei had bene most wicked offendours, put to moste cruell deathes, saith, *Dum hæc geruntur, rursus piorum virorū fuga oritur: iterumq; agri, iterum solitudines, sylvæ, & montes seruos Dei suscipiunt.* y is to say: when these cruell doinges and persecutions were in hande, than were godlie men diuē againe to sit: fieldes, wildernes, wooddes, & hilles, againe receiue & couer y seruantes of God. The same wordes doth Eusebius reherse againe worde by worde, in the beginning of his secōd booke of the life of Cōstantine, declaring a farre contrary iudgement of fieldes, wildernes, & wooddes (which he calleth y receipts, & couertures of the seruantes of God, in the  
time

time of persequition) to M. Dormans opinion of them, terminge them with Hosius, *lyfkes corners*. And in y<sup>e</sup> pro-  
 cesse of that booke Eusebius sheweth, howe y<sup>e</sup> extremitie  
 of the persequitions was suche, that no wooddes, nor  
 wildernes coulde hide the seruantes of God, from the  
 crueltie of the persequitozs: but y<sup>e</sup> they were saine to  
 forsake their natie countrey, and to flie into sarre and  
 strange countreies, euē amongst the barbarous people  
 to saue their lines: reppouing the extremitie of y<sup>e</sup> cruell  
 persequitozs their countrey men, by the gentilnes of y<sup>e</sup>  
 barbarous nations, that receiued, and saued them. Per-  
 ther let M. Dorman obteet to me, that this was the per-  
 sequition of the Heathen, which is now ceased. For the  
 cruell persequitiō of Popes & their Prelates hath now  
 of longe béene so manifest, that such as other wise do fa-  
 uour them, are dyuen to confesse it: as doth amongst o-  
 thers S. Bernard most expresse by these wordes. *Vide-*  
*tur iā cessasse persequutio, imo iam incipit persequutio ab*  
*illis, qui in Ecclesia primas obtinēt. Amici tui & proximi tui*  
*aduersus te steterent. Egressa est iniquitas à senioribus, iudi-*  
*cibus, vicarijs tuis, qui videntur regere populum tuum. Nō*  
*possum<sup>o</sup> iā dicere, vt est populus, sic est sacerdos: quoniā nō*  
*ira est populus vt sacerdos. Heu Heu Domine De<sup>o</sup> ipsi sunt*  
*in persequitione primi, qui videntur in Ecclesia tua primarū*  
*diligere, & gerere principatū, &c.* y<sup>e</sup> is to say: Persecutiō  
 seemeth nowe to be ceased, nay nowe beginneth perse-  
 quition by them, who haue y<sup>e</sup> chiefe places in y<sup>e</sup> Church.  
 Thy friendes & thy kinsfolkes, or neighbours do stāde  
 against thee. Wickednes hath proceded frō the elders,  
 iudges, thy vicars, who do seeme to rule thy people.  
 Perther can we now say, as is y<sup>e</sup> people, so is the Priest:  
 for y<sup>e</sup> people be not so, as is the Priest. Ah ah Lord God,  
 thei be y<sup>e</sup> chiefe in persequiting, who do seeme to loue y<sup>e</sup>

Hosius fol. 68. &  
 69. Lucos istos  
 & lucifcos.  
 Euseb. ibidem  
 fa. 182.

Barnar. in eouer-  
 sione D. Pauli.

primacie, or chiefe place, and to haue the principate. Thus doth S. Barnarde notifie, who be the persecutors, not the Heathen now so muche, as the chiefe of Churchemen them selves.

But no place is more euident either for our woꝛrefuges, in time of persecution, or against the popishe glorious Churches, in comparison whereof M. Doꝛmā derideth our blinde cellars, and rottē barnes, as it pleaseth him to terme them, than is that in Hilarius against Aurentius the haretike, likewise bragginge of his Catholike Church, and gay temples, as do our Papisstes now. His woꝛdes are these: Male vos parietum amor cepit: male Ecclesiam Dei in tectis & domicilijsq; veneramini: male sub ijs pacis nomen ingeritis. Anne ambiguum est, in ijs Antichristum esse sessurum; Montes mihi, & siluæ, & lacus, & carceres, & voragines sunt tutiores: in illis enim Prophetæ, aut manentes, aut demersi, Dei spiritu prophetabant. that is to say: You be naughtilie in loue with walles: you do naughtilie reuerence the Church of God in houses and buildinges: you do naughtilie vnder the cloke of these thinges, bragge of the name of peace. Is there any doubt but that Antichriste shall sitte in these Temples: Mountaines, and woꝛddes, and lakes, and pysons, and deape dongeons, or caues, are more safer for me: for in them the Prophetes either remaine, or imprisoned, did prophete by the inspiration of Goddes spirite.

Lo M. Doꝛman, that holse, and most ancient father, and learned doctour Hilarius, reꝛoueth this affection in you, who do likewise so highly esteeme your highe Synagoges,

Hilarius contra  
Aurentium,

Synagoges, and glorioſous temples, iudging and eſteeming the Church of God by ſuch ſumptuous buildings: who but Hilarius affirmeth y<sup>e</sup> Antichriſt ſhalbe founde ſitting in ſuch glorioſous temples, and the true p<sup>ro</sup>phetes of God ſhalbe found in hilles, wooddes, and wildernes (whiche you doe deſpiſe and deride) & that therefore not onely hilles, wooddes, and wildernes, ſaith Hilarius, but alſo priſons, and dongeons (whereinto you caſt the ſeale ſervantes of God) are to him moze ſafe, than your highe, huge, and moſt glorioſous Popiſhe Synagoges. Wherefoze if you will finde out the hill aultars, and groues, wherein Idolatrie was committed amongeſt Chriſtians, as it was amongeſt the Iues, you muſt not ſeake in the wooddes, blynde cellars, and rotten barnes, which, in feare of your extreamer crueltie, & tyranie covered vs, where no Idoles were erected, no Idolatrie was committed: but you muſt ſeake vpon the toppes of the hilles, where your Popiſhe chappels, with Devilſh Idoles, and aultars in them, were ſtanding, and horrible Idolatrie committed: or you muſt go to your huge high Abbets, and Friers houſes, builded on height like mountaines, manie whereof had alſo groues: and wooddes about them, there ſhall you finde luſke corners enough, anguler aultars, where angular maſſes were ſaid, and anguler Idolatrie was daplie committed: and other luſkiſhe ſecret corners, where ſuche woozkes of darkenes were perpetrate, and committed, as are not meete to come to anye light of relation, nor ſhall not ſo me in deede. And if you liſt ſee an expreſſe Image of ſuche groues, as theſe godly Kinges cut vp, & deſtroyed, whiche the vnlearned can not ſo wel knowe, at theſe dayes, as they know hilles, you haue a paterne

of one of them out of antiquitie, described by Eusebius  
 in his second booke of the life of Constantine, by these  
 very wordes: Erat autem nemus irriguum & amplū.  
 In hoc erant varia ex lapidū sculpturis posita Deo-  
 rum, vt putabant, simulachra, quibus cum candelis  
 cereis accensis pro consuetudine sacrificauit, that is:  
 ther was a groue, which had a riuer running thpough  
 it. In it there were diuers Images of the Goddes ( as  
 they tooke it) caruen in stoncs, to the whiche Images  
 he did sacrifice, with many candels light, as their cus-  
 tome is. Thus saue Eusebius. Where you may see no  
 rotten barne, noz blinde cellar, noz suche a woodd net-  
 ther, as covered vs from your furious tyzannke, describ-  
 ed: but such a large groue, with a ryuer in it, oz by it,  
 as comenly your Abbels, and Frter houles tooode in:  
 not a couer of feare ( as were our woodds) but a place  
 of holines (as thought your Ponkes and Frters) stan-  
 ding full of Idols and Images of stone, befoze whome  
 was plentie of war candels burning, and sacrifice done.  
 Would you not thinke god Reader, that Eusebius had  
 seene befoze his eyes one of our Idolatrous Abbeies,  
 when he did writte this: And soz these & suche like most  
 wicked Idolatries, and other detestable dedes, moze  
 meeter soz swyne, and other bzute beastes, than soz mē,  
 perpetrated in suche groues, and luske coznors, as these  
 were, by those bzutishe babes, of that strōge strompet,  
 and holke whoze the Romishe Church, are the same  
 luske coznors, and dennes, by Gods iust iudgement  
 scoured, as we doe see at this daie comme to passe, and  
 some of them are in dede left soz Hozses, Shepe, and  
 Swyne, as lesse noysome bzute beastes, than were  
 those monstrous Ponkes, and filthie Frters, that pos-  
 sessed

setted them befoze: with the enuile whereof P. Dozman  
 yet nowe the thirde time goeth about to burthen vs.  
 But soz the auoidinge of tediousnes, I doe remitte the  
 Reader, that either hath not read, or remembzeth not  
 my full answer thereto, soz his further satisfaction to  
 resozt to the same in my booke befoze.

Fol. 13. &amp;c.

In the first part  
of mine answer.

Dorman. Fol. 39.

And thus may you see good readers, that all thiese examples  
 alleaged by our aduersaries are to no purpose, as of the whiche  
 some, as of Kinge Dauid (who was not a Kinge onely but a Pro-  
 phete also) containe a manifest fallacie, other that of Iosue, that  
 he should receiue. especiall commaundement of almightie God to  
 meddle with Religion, an impudent lie: some as of Salomon, Eze-  
 chias, and Iehu, a figure or phrase of speche, as by the scriptures  
 I haue proued, and as of Iosias may be also truly answered, who  
 enterprised nothing, before he had caused the Priestes first, to goe  
 and consulte what he should doe: and other some suche, as of Io-  
 saphat and Ioas, as no man euer denied to kinges, yea manie wishe  
 that in the practisinge thereof, they had in times past, and at this  
 daie also would, shewe them selues muche more forwarde then  
 they haue or doe.

Norwell.

And thus may you see good Readers, suche an im-  
 pudent Papist, as you, noz any man els did euer see be-  
 foze: who as he passed ouer in silence befoze those ma-  
 nifold most plaine and effectuous examples of godlie  
 Kinges, intermedling in matters of Religio, and vsing  
 of their right, superozittie, and authozitte ouer Priestes:  
 so nowe with greater silence soz his purpose passinge  
 them.

them ouer here, saith, they are to no purpose. But for that byzuitte with silence of their notable authoritie, is moze to M. Dozmans purpose than myne, I am not purposed to be so thort no; secret.

M. Dozman doth bouldly without blushing to couer his fallacie, affirme that King David did vse his so manifest and mansould authoritie ouer Priestes, and in matiers of Religion, as hath bene befoze declared, by the priuilege of his pꝛophecie: whiche to be a fallacie, is pꝛoued manifestly by that, y many other godlie Kinges no Pꝛophetes, haue likewise ordinarie used the lyke authoritie, as both hath bene largelie, and yet shalbe moze fullie, and manifestlie pꝛoued and declared.

And notwithstanding, that the holie Scripture expꝛesslie declareth that God commaunded Iosua to keepe, and to do the whole Lawe of the Lorde, and to studie the booke of the same Lawe day & night: that he might of him selfe vnderstande howe to directe his waies, and gouerne Gods people, and that the people of God pꝛomised obedience to him in all thinges, euen as they were obediēt befoze, to Moses, (whiche was in matiers Ecclesiasticall, as well as Ciuill) and that whosoener, (without exception) should gaineſate Iosue, and not do all his commaundementes, should suffer death: all the whiche notwithstanding, and Iosue practising also authoritie ouer the Priestes, and in Church matiers, as is plainely in the hystorie of Iosua recorded, M. Dozman dare yet charge vs by name, but in dede the holie Scriptures, with a most impudent lie: as though Iosua had receiued no especiall commaundement touching Religion. Whereas, as well his maister D. Hardinge, as their authour Cardinal Hosius, do both cōfesse, that a  
godlie

D. Hard. Cōfut.  
Apolo. fol. 303.  
Ho, li. 2. fo. 106. a

godlie Prince is the keeper of both the tables of Gods Lawe, may, and ought to punish, the transgressours thereof, forbid, abolish, and put away, Idolatrics, blasphemies, mans woord preached for Gods worde, may and ought to mainteine and set forth godlie doctrine, & to forbid, and abolish the wicked doctrine, and woorthippings: all these thinges expressely confesseth Hosius your authour, the same in effecte, acknowlegeth your maister D. Harding, whiche thinges to do, what is it elles, but to medle with Religion? You may therefore moze iustlie chardge your authour, and maister, with an impudent lie, than the Apologie, and in dede either they, whoso plainely and particularly do affirme that godlie Princes be the keepers of both the tables, and ought to mainteine and set forth true doctrine, and abolish the false doctrines, and woorthippings &c. that is, may medle in Religion, or you, that saye they may not, do lie most impudentlie.

And where D. Dormā vnder the colour of a figure, attempteth to delude the Scriptures expressely testifying, that King Solomon deposed the high Priest Abiathar, & placed an other, to wit Sadocke, in his rowme: declaring thereby his authoritie ouer them both: and by the like figure would blemish king Ezechias woordes to the Priestes, as the woordes of the father speakinge to his childe (for he expressely calleth the Priestes his childe) would blemish the same King Ezechias his commaunding of the Priestes, his instructing of them, his putting downe of Idolatrye, his breaking downe of the brazen Serpent, and his reforming of all partes of Religion, by the like figure: together with Kinge Iehu his iustice, in killing the false Idolatrous Priestes: and

3. Reg. 22

King Josias his authoritie, in putting downe the like  
 Idolatries, and Idolatrous Priestes, and in sendinge  
 of Helcias the highe Priest, with the other Priestes on  
 his message, in matters of Religion, to Holda the Pro-  
 phetesse, and in commaunding them in all thinges con-  
 cerning Religion. M. Dozman going about to delude  
 al these most plaine saynges, and doings of these god-  
 lie Princes, expressely declaringe their authoritie over  
 Priestes, and in matters of Religion, by a phrase or fi-  
 gure of speache, he sheweth him selfe to be very Poet-  
 rick, phantasiyng, and feining figures where none be.  
 And by the same poetrie he saith: that King Iehosaphat  
 his sendinges of the Priestes & Cleargie to preache in  
 his visitation, his teaching of them their duties, assign-  
 ing to them their offices, & comaunding of the to do  
 same: and king Joas his rebuking the negligence of the  
 Cleargie, and repressing their auarice, and abuses, yea  
 and blaming Joiada him selfe the highe Priest: these  
 thinges saith M. Dozman, are such, as no man euer de-  
 nied to kinges, to do: but would wishe they were more  
 forwarde than they be, in doinge of them: but all the  
 world knoweth the contrarie: that stoward Priestes,  
 can by no meanes abide, such forwardnes in Princes.  
 Al these so plaine and effectuous saynges and doings,  
 of so many godlie Kinges, mooste manifestly declaringe  
 their right to intermedle in matters of Religion, and  
 their superiortie over the high Priestes, and Cleargie,  
 doth M. Dozman byiesly without naming of any, but by  
 the figure vericentria, passing them over in silēce, as be-  
 fore, so likewise here, most impudentlie terme figures &  
 phrases of speache. But I pray God that such figures &  
 phrases may one day, as truly without al figure be re-  
 scuted

ented by our Christian Princes, in all good and godly reformation of Religion, and in bidding of the pꝛesumptuous, ignorant, and wicked Popish Cleargie: as they were by those godly Princes trulie, without all figure, or feining, done and accomplished. We should than see a farre better figure of true Religion, & Christs church, than we haue had hitherto, in the popithe Church.

And where amongst other thinges he saith, that he hath befoze proued his assertion by the Scriptures, and namely concerning, Solomon, Ezechias, & Jehu, that is in deede too figuratly and poeticallic spoken by M. Dorman. For if it may please y good Readers to resort back to those his scripturall proueses, whiche are befoze, you shall finde his marginal notes 3. Reg. i. Eccle. cap. 48. 4. Reg. cap. 9. as though in those places it were declared, that Solomon had counsel or authoritie of Sadock & Patha, to depose Abschar the highe Priest, & to place Sadock in his roome: as though Ezechias had counsel or authoritie of Eliaas the Prophet, to breake down the brazen Serpent: and as though Jehu had counsel or authoritie of Elizæus to kill the Idolatrous Priests. But whan you seeke the places noted, you shall finde neither there, nor els where in the Scripture any such thing, or any one word: & therfoze he being cotented only to make his marginal notes of y, which is no where to be found, & so leauing his scripturall proueses, whiche he here braggeth of, and trusting that you would beleaue him vpon his bare woorde, as he is no lesse woorty, he falleth there to the prouinge of his figure, by phrascs of commune speache, and commune talke (for thus he speaketh) as whoe woulde saie that Queene Marie deprived Thomas Cranmer, and yet was she God worre, not the chiefe doer thereof, but an instrument ioyninge with the Rope in the execution

Dor. before  
fol. 38. b.  
And in this  
booke fol.  
189. & 183.

Dor. sup. fo. 38. b  
M. Dormans  
Scriptures are  
phrases of com-  
mune talke.

of his determination. And so say we in like manner, that the prince hath made such a man Bishop, where he hath onely commended him by his letters, and so yeat left the electiō free. These be **P. Doz** mans his stone toozdes, and these be his pzooves: other than these out of Scripture, or no Scripture, for these matters hath be none. And thus muche for the summarie reherfall of his pzooves, that these most notable exāples, of so manie godlie Kinges, shuld be to no purpose.

Now to **P. Doz** mans second answer, for I beleaue him selfe did not muche like this.

*Dorman. Fol. 39.*

And last of all you may see, that all were it so that euerie example had plainly concluded their intention, that yet it is no good reason to say, that therefore our kinges now a daies must haue the like authoritie: no more then this, that if Moyses had byn no Priest, it shuld folowe that other temporall gouernours might consecrate Bishoppes, because he did beinge none consecrate his brother Aaron, or that because Dauid had many wiues, therefore our Kinges also may: or the cleargie put to death kinges because Samuel did, or Priestes kille adulterers after th example of Phinees, or one spoile another (I meane of them that be of contrarie opinions in religion) because the children of Israel spoiled the Egipcians.

Exo. 3.

Nowell.

These tend inductiōs brought in for the summarie of his second answer, nothing hinder our reasoninge from the examles of godlie Kinges of those daies to Christian Princes of our time: for though our Princes (no noz Priestes, noz the Pope him selfe) may not, noz can not do diuers thinges, which Moses by special pzoilege and comissiō miraculously did: yet may Christian Princes

Princes doe such thinges as he & all other godly Kinges vsually did, without such priuilege: which is, to reforme Religion, and to reprove and correct Priestes, that doe not their duetie. And what though Christian Princes may not haue many wiues as Dauid had, seinge that the multitude of wiues at once is expressely forbidden to Christians, by our Sauiour Christe in the nue Testament: What letteth that but they may reforme and restore true Religion, and order the Priestes, as did King Dauid: whiche to doe is forbidden to godly Princes neither in the ould Testament, nor in the nue: but by the vsuall examples of godly Princes in both the ould Testament, and Christian Religion proued to be lafull. Priestes may neither put to death Kinges, nor other men, for the speciall priuilege of Samuell and Phinees serueth but for them selves alone, and can not discharge either Priestes or any other men, from the generall commaundement of God, thou shalt not kill, and honour & obey the Kinge. But speciall or generall commaundement forbidding godly Princes to intermedle in the reformation of Religion, or to reprove and correct wicked Priestes, in the Scriptures haue you none. Likewise of the example of the childzen of Israell spoilinge the Egyptians (whiche example not mentioned any where before M. Dozman here in his conclusion adioineth for a surplusage) it is no good reason (saith M. Dozman) to say that therefore one may spoile another of contrarie opinions in Religion: whiche doctrine I wishe he would better teache his Papistes, that they might once cease from spoilinge of vs, not of our godes onely moste couetouslie, but of our liues also most cruely. But to the matter I say, the generall commaundement of God: Thou shalt not steale,

binding al men, is a let why this special example of the Israelites, by special dispensation spoiling y<sup>e</sup> Egyptians, may not be folowed of vs. If you will therefore make our reasoning, from y<sup>e</sup> due doinges, of ould godly Kinges in matiers of Religion, & controuling of leud Priestes, not doinge their duetie, like to your leud exāples, show where God hath made any restraint by generall or speciall commaundement, that our Kinges may not solow them in dealinge in matiers of Religion, and controulinge of ignozant or wicked Priestes, as I haue shewed restraintes & causes, why they may not solow them in hauing many wiues: and why Priestes may not solow Samuell and Phinees in puttinge wicked Kinges to death, or killinge adulterers: and why we may not solow the Israelites spoilinge the Egyptians, by spoiling one an other: whiche if you, noz all Papistes with you, can not do, leaue of once to goe about, by such sophistrie and fallacie to bleare the eies of the simple people: and withhall to make your selfe not onely for your foolishnes, ridiculous to all wise and discrete men: but also for your falschode, and most impudent shamelesnes, most odious to all god and true men,

Dorman. Fol. 40.

And here there cometh to my remembrance an other cause, why that reason of theirs should be naught whiche is this, that the priesthood of the Iewes was altogether carnall and flesheby, and might therefore the rather be subject to the Kinges, whereas the priesthood of the newe Testament is so much more excellent then that, as by how muche the matter and object about whiche it is occupied, the head, author, and chiefe Priest thereof (which is no other then Christe him selfe the eternall Priest accordinge to the ordre of Melchise-

Psalm. 110.

*Melchisedech) doeth farre surmount either the matter, the Priest or  
priesthood of theirs.*

*No well.*

M. Dormans memoize cometh vpon him a pace, for  
as it serued him immediatly befoze, with an example,  
of spoilinge earst not thought vpon, so doeth it now  
minister to him a whole nue answeare: whiche, in  
case all the other faile him, will yet he trusteth, serue  
the turne. But it may so fall out with M. Dorman,  
and his plentie of answeares: as it did with one, that  
had many occupations and yet coulde thziue by none  
of them, for that of so manie, there was neuer an  
one god. And I pray the good Reader, consider  
whether M. Dorman, by this variable multitude of an-  
sweares, do not after a sorte confesse, that him selfe  
doeth like neuer an one of them, as sure enough to  
sticke to. One while, Moses is a Prieste: an other  
while, in a case no Prieste. One while, Kinge Dauid  
did not intermedle in Religion at all: an otherwhile,  
*it beinge graunted by the waye of reasoning that he did inter-* Dorm. sup. fol.  
*medle in the affaires of Religion, yet may not our Kinges* 36. b. & 38. a.  
doo likewise, for that they be no Prophetes as he  
was. One while all other godly auncient Kinges,  
whiche were no Prophetes, did not medle with Reli-  
gion at all: an other while, though they did, yet may  
not our Kinges doo so likewise: no moze than haue  
many wiues as they had: whiche is a reason, not  
suche as made the goose as goeth the proverbe, but  
suche as M. Dorman dreamed of. And thus, with  
*Moses was a Prieste, he was no Prieste: Kinge Da-*  
*uid did not intermedle at all in matters of Religion,*  
Kinge

King Dauid did intermeble in them, but as a Prophet,  
 not as a Kinge: other auncient godly Kinges did not  
 this, they did this, hath M. Dozman dalied out a longe  
 processe. And as though he had not yet bene various,  
 and diuers enough, in pꝛæmeditate and foze studied an-  
 sweares, he addeth one other, sodenly ministered vnto  
 him by his memoꝛie: the effect whereof is this. *The Iuishe*  
*Priesthoode beinge altogether carnall and fleashly might well be*  
*subiect to Kinges, but the Priesthoode of the nue Testament is so*  
*much more excellent, than that priesthoode was, that it may not in*  
*any wise be subiect to Kinges. In deede seinge the pꝛiesthod*  
*of the nue Testament is so spirituall and excellent (as*  
*M. Dozman saith) it was great pittie, that such a sozte*  
*of carnall and fleashlye lubbars, as were the popishe*  
*Pꝛiestes, had any thinge a doo with the ministerie ther-*  
*of. And I thinke that was one cause, why they by litle*  
*and litle drew their ministerie from the spirituall ser-*  
*uinge of Goddes people by the preaching of his worde,*  
*and other spirituall seruice, to all carnall ceremonies,*  
*superstitious, & the outwarde elementes of this worlde,*  
*not onely Iuishe like, but Pagane and Heathen like al-*  
*so: that seinge they coulde not be fitte ministers for so*  
*spirituall a Pꝛiesthoode, as Chꝛiste had instituted, they*  
*might deuise a Pꝛiesthoode fitt for them selves. And yet*  
*and Godwill, these holy Pꝛiestes, which were alwaies*  
*most abiealy subiect to all carnall lustes, and serued the*  
*beggerly elementes of this worlde, might not be sub-*  
*iect to their godly Pꝛince. I graunt in deede ꝑ Chꝛistes*  
*Pꝛiesthoode is infinitely moze excellent, than was the*  
*Pꝛiesthoode of the ould lawe. But I do denie that the*  
*popishe Pꝛiesthoode hath any excellencie, or godnes in*  
*it at all. And M. Dozman doeth not well consider the*  
 difference

Difference betwene the Iues and vs, by the matter, and  
 object, the head, author, and chiefe Priest, (whiche saith he) is  
 none other than Christe him selfe the eternall Priest. For the  
 Scriptures do teach, that the godly Iues did eate of the 1. Corinth. 10.  
 same spirituall meate, and drinke of the same spirituall  
 rocke, which is Christ, as we do. And Christ beinge an  
 eternall Priest (as M. Doorman truely saith) he was al-  
 so a Priest in the ould law, for y<sup>e</sup> eternitie of his Priest-  
 hood reacheth from ende to ende. And he hath hearde I  
 thinke, that the lambe was slaine from the beginninge Apocal. 13.  
 of the worlde. Wherefore the godly Iuishe Priestes  
 had Christe him selfe, the matter, the object, the head,  
 author, and chiefe Priest, as we haue. But I graunt,  
 as I said, y<sup>e</sup> the Iuishe Priesthood is infinitely inferiour  
 to Christes Priesthood, and that it was but a figure of  
 Christes Priesthood, and that it was but temporall,  
 where Christes is eternall: and that whan one Iuishe  
 Priest was dead, he had an other that succeeded him to  
 continue the Priesthood: but Christe beinge the eternall Hebr. 5. & 7.  
 Priest, and his sacrifice also eternall, once for all eter-  
 nitie offered, is euer present, and needeth no successor,  
 nor vicar generall. But your Pope who will needes be  
 his vicar, as though he were absent: and your popishe  
 Priestes, as though he were dead, or his sacrifice cea-  
 sed, and as though they were his successors, wil needes  
 often offre that his sacrifice, whiche the Scriptures ex- Hebr. 7. & 9. 10.  
 pressly say, shalbe no moze offered. Wherefore you Papi-  
 ses thus dealinge as though Christ his Priesthood, and  
 sacrifice were not eternall, vnlesse it were continually  
 mainteined by you, do manifest iniurie & contumelie to  
 Christes Priesthood, & sacrifice: & do blasphemously di-  
 minishe the excellencie thereof, makinge it like to the

Sacerdotes, & sacrifici, ex profbyteris.

Juishe Priesthood, whiche had neede of suche deputies, vicars, and successours. And thus where you should by preachinge of the gospell, as becometh Christes ministers, haue declared the vertue, excellencie, and eternitie of Christes Priesthood and sacrifice: You, leauinge your office, are become sacrificers your selves, to the great derogation, & vtter destruction of Christes priesthode, and sacrifice, as much as in you doeth lie. Which your pretended Priesthode, and surmised sacrifice, is not as you say, more excellent than y<sup>e</sup> Juishe Priesthood, and sacrifice: but infinitely worse, and in deede abominable, as a monstre compounded of Iudaisme, Paganisme, and Christianitie. For you haue Aarons Juishe apparell, and smearing with oile, and many other Juishe ceremonies: and you haue besides, moe Ethnisch rites, and specially abominable Idolatrie: of Christianitie you haue lefte, but some patches yet and sholwes. But your chiefe office standeth in surmised sacrifices, in grosse Idolatries, in mindles mutterings, & in dombe ceremonies. Wherefore it is no meruaile that you bragge of so holy, spirituall, and excellent a Priesthood by you possessed, that you may by no meanes be inferiour to your godly Princes.

Dorman. Fol. 40.

Whiche thinge s. Petre did not obscurely signifie by these wordes: vos estis regale sacerdotium you are a kingely priest. i. Cap. 2. hooche. as who should say the priesthoode before was not kingly, for that that Kinges ruled ouer Priestes, but now is the priesthoode kingly, for that to it be subiect euen Kinges them selues.

Nowell.

Now sit here is suche a texte now come to his memorie,

rie, for the discharge of popthe Priestes from all sub-  
 iectiō to Chyistian Princes, that he is contented to geue  
 ouer all that longe plea, whiche he befoze made for the  
 Iuiſhe Priestes, and to leaue them in the byters, and in  
 subiectiō to their Kinges. Now surely M. Dozman you  
 might haue done very well, and haue spared your selfe  
 and me, and the poze Readers (whiche are much encom-  
 bzed with vs) of much labour, and tediousnes, had this  
 at the firste come to your remembraunce, and had you  
 confessed, that it was S. Peters minde, and that not obscurely by  
 him signified, that the Priesthood of the ould lawe was not kingly,  
 for that the Kinges ruled ouer those Priestes. For I assure you,  
 you haue made a longe and tedious adoe, to pzooue that  
 those Princes ruled not ouer those Priestes: but nowe  
 feinge those Priestes were so unhappie, to haue suche a  
 carnall and fleshly Priesthode, and so to remaine  
 remediles vnder the subiectiō of their godly Kinges,  
 let them goe, on Goddes name. Well, but the Priesthoode  
 is kingely, nowe (saith M. Dozman) for that Kinges them-  
 selves are subiect to it. Yet is here a double doubt remain-  
 inge: for firste, it seemeth those Iuiſhe Priestes might  
 haue bene releued of their seruitute had they conside-  
 red this gære well: but it is not giuen to euery man,  
 to see so farre in a milne stone, as doeth M. Dozman.  
 For euen in the ould Testament God saith to the Is-  
 raelites by Moses, after this sorte: Si ergo audieritis  
 vocē meā &c. vos eritis mihi in regnū sacerdotale, &  
 gens sancta. Hæc sunt verba quę loqueris ad filios Is-  
 rael. ¶ Is to say: If you heare my voice (saith y Lord) you  
 shalbe vnto me a priestly Kingedome, & an holy nation.  
 These be the wordes whiche y shal speake to y childzē  
 of Israell. Thus farre is the texte. Now M. Dozman here

Exod. 19. 2. 5. 6.

ts as muche for the priestly Kingdome of the oulde law, out of Goddes owne mouth, as you haue out of S. Peters, for your kingly Priesthood of the nue. And in deede all the oulde doctours affirme, that S. Peters wordes in that place by M. Dozman alleaged, are nothinge els but an allusion to this place of the oulde Testament, and a very repetition and reherfall of Goddes wordes there: and so it is also noted in the coatations of all the bookes, that I haue sene, both in the ould Testament and the nue. But bilike M. Dozman his booke was not marked in the margent, or elles he beinge more than halfe a slepe, did not marke it: or elles he did not looke vpon the booke, but alleaged this ferte out of his memorie, as he saith. For doubtlesse had he noted it, he woulde not so haue giuen ouer the priestly Kingdome of the ould law, but he woulde thereby haue defended their poore oulde Iusthe Priestes from all subiection to Princes, as well as his popithe Priestes. And thus you see it is nether good for M. Dozman, vpon confidence of his memorie, to make suche discordeinge descante vpon the plaine textes of the Scripture, nor for vs to credite M. Dozmans memorie too muche.

The seconde doubtte and farre worse (if worse may be) for M. Dozmans parte, is. That the wordes, *if you heare my voice you shall be vnto me a priestely Kingedome, and an holie nation, or people, are spoken by Moses from God, to all the whole people of Israell: whiche, I trowe, were not all Priestes. Likewise are these wordes of S. Peter. You are a chosen generation a kingly Priesthood, an holie nation, and a peculiar people: spoken of all the Godly, that dwelled as straungers here and there throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia,*

Exod. 19. 2. 3. 6.  
 Hæc annūtiabis  
 domui Iacob.  
 Hæc loqueris ad  
 filios Israel.  
 1. Petr. 2. Vos e-  
 stis gen<sup>s</sup> electū,  
 regale sacerdo-  
 tiū, gens sancta,  
 populus acqui-  
 sitionis.

Asia and Bithinia: to whom this Epistle, (as doeth in the  
 beginning of it appeare) was written, who were not al  
 Priestes, I beleaue. For though M. Dozman thinketh  
 that the title of a Kinglie Priesthoode doeth appertaine  
 to his Popishe Priestes alone, yet I trust he will not  
 haue them, muche lesse them alone, called the holie na  
 tion, the peculiar people, the choosen generation of  
 God: for it were a strange phrase to say, the generatio,  
 nation, or people of Priestes. And though M. Dozman  
 like the phrase as proper enough to Priestes: yet is it  
 not a true phrase, be it neuer so proper, to call them a  
 chosen generation, a holie nation, or peculiar people of  
 God, being in dede the viperous generation, wicked  
 nation, and peaufthe people of proude popishe Priestes.  
 And here falleth out also an other vnlooked for mischiefe  
 against M. Dozma, that those wordes, which he would  
 (oborto collo as they say) violently wrest to his po  
 pish Priestes onely, doe indifferently appertaine to all  
 godlie men, as well of the Laste, as of the Cleargie,  
 as well of the Iues, as of the Christians, as by Gods  
 stonemouthe expresse spoken, and S. Peters penns  
 expresse written too, and of them all indifferently.  
 And that would I here proue by the agreeable interpre  
 tations of the ancient Doctours, as well vpon the saide  
 place of the ould Testament, as vpon this place of S.  
 Peter by M. Dozman alleaged, sauing that I doe thinke  
 that his maisters D. Hardinges instructions might  
 schoole him best in this point: whose alleaginge both  
 these places out of the .xix. of Exodus, and of the firste  
 of S. Peter, the seconde chapter, hath these wordes:

*According to the same meaning whereas the people of Israel were D. Hard. Cōfus.  
 called Regnum sacerdotale, a Priestlie kingdome: S. Peter wri. Apolo. fo. 305. a.*

ring to *Christians*, turned the ordre of the wordes, calling the church of *Christ* *Sacerdotium Regale*, a *kinglie* priesthood.

Lo *P. Doyma*: your maister, *D. Harding* teacheth you, that the people of *Israel*, (not onelie the *Priestles*) were called *Regnum sacerdotale* a *Priestlie* kingdom: and that *S. Peter* vsed the same wordes, though turned in ordre, of *Christians* (not of *Priestles* onely) calling the Church of *Christ*, *Sacerdotium regale*, a *kinglie* Priesthood, as befoze God called the people of *Israel* a *priestlie* kingdome. And thus your duple dotage, & ridiculous ignorance, supposinge and teachinge the saide wordes of *S. Peter* to appertaine neither to the godlie *Zues*, nor to lay men being true *Christians*, but onelie to your *Pope*, & popish *Priestles*, is by y<sup>e</sup> manifest tertes them selues, with not onely the ancient *Doctours*, but *D. Harding* your maisters expositiō thereupon, detected in such sort, y<sup>e</sup> though it be not to your blushing (being shamelesse) yet may it lustily be to the shame of all your coucellers & helpers about you, that shuld moze narrowlie haue ouersene you, and looked better to such your grosse, and beetell blynde oversightes at the least.

Now to proceade, if by Gods owne wordes, and *S. Peters* expresse testimonie, and *D. Hardinges* plaine confession, all godlie *Christians*, though *Lay men*, be partakers of this *kinglie* priesthood, I trust that godly *Christian* *Princes* are not destitute of the same: & that consequently, popishe *Priests* are not so princelie, but y<sup>e</sup> *Christian* *Princes* hauing besides their worldly kingdome, a princely priesthood, and priestlie kingdom, may be bould to tell *Priestles* of their duttie neglected, or to punish them not amending. But the *Pope* & his *Priestles*, haue so long vsed them selues so *Lordlie* & princely ouer

rely ouer Princes, that M. Dozman thinketh it a meruallous, and moske inconuenient thinge, that Princes should haue ought to doe with them: and therefore what soeuer cometh, though but madlie in his memozte, or sodenlie to his sight, sounding of any rule, dominion, or authoritie, he streight streineth it to serue the vsurped tyzannie of the Pope, and his Prelates, to proue them not onely Priestes, but princely Priestes also forsooth. Pea and suche princelle Priestes, as should haue Kinges them selues subject to their becke.

And is it not well done of M. Dozman to trowe you, vpon a good liking of this text, to forsake al his former answers, that ould Princes had no rule ouer y Priestes of the ould Lawe, so longe befoze by him sticke vnto, and so largelie and laboriouslie defended, and sodenlie now to confesse, that the Kinges ruled ouer the Iultha Priestes, as hauing a carnall and deathlie priesthood. And all this doth he, vpon confidence of so sure a pillar to leane vnto, as is this his glose and comment vpon S. Peters woordes, whiche doe moske plainely make godlie Princes equall with godlie Priestes, in the possession of the kinglie priesthoode, and priestlie kingdome: and consequentlie doe make godlie Princes infinite superiours to all Popes & popishe Priestes, who haue no part, neither of godlie priesthood, nor priestlie kingdome: but haue onely a surmised priesthood, and an vsurped tyzannie, taken vp them selues, moske expresse against Gods most holie woorde.

And thus M. Dozman, who hath bene so long stumbling in the slipperie myze of his vncerten answers, is now at the last by log seeking falle quite ouer the eares into the dirtie donge of doultshe dotage, and most shamefull and shameles impudencie.

A REPROVE OF M.

Dorman. Fol. 43.

Which neither is any suche great absurditie (if we indifferently wey the matter) as some men would haue it seme to be, considering that Ignatius disciple to S. Iohn the Euangelist, that all the auncient fathers, doe moste plainelie affirme the same: neither yet anie great reason why thiese woordes shoulde be to any man cause of offence, seing that when all is counted, this honour of gouernement resteth not in the Priestes, but goeth farder to God him selfe whose ministers they are: as contrariwise the dishonor, the contumelies and reproches doenvnto them, are doen also to Christ as him selfe witnesseih. Qui vos spernit me spernit, he that despiseth you despiseth me.

That king should subiect priestes absurditie at all.

Luce. 10

Hosias. fol. 45.

Nowell

Here you must beleaue him againe vpon his word, as he is no lesse woorthy, that Ignatius disciple to S. Iohn the Euangelist, and all ancient fathers, doe moste plainelie affirme the same: that is, that kinges should be subiect to Priestes: and the same to be no absurditie at all. No doubt, they affirme it euen as plainelie, as S. Peter euen nowe affirmed it, accozding as you haue heard: that is, the cleane contrarie. For that all true Christians, as well Lay men, as Priestes, are partakers of the kinglie priesthoode. (whiche is the same y<sup>e</sup> Peter saith) Ignatius no doubt, and all anciēt fathers, wil agree with S. Peter therein. Concerning the reason, why it should be no inconuenience, nor cause of offence to any, that Princes should be subiect to Priestes, for that this honour of gouernemēt resteth not in the Priestes, but goeth farder to God him selfe, whose ministers thei are. I pray you god M. Dormā, by the same reason to persuaide y<sup>e</sup> Stubberne & rebellious Pope, his prelatz & priestes, once to submit the selves to their Princes, for y<sup>e</sup> the honoz of gouernement resteth

reſteth not only in ſe Princes, but goeth further to God, Rom. 13.  
 whose miniſters theſe are, & of the worthineſſe of the ſaid  
 miniſterie, God doth vouchſaue to communicate to the  
 the name of the Godds, rather then to Biſhoppes. Pſalm. 82.

Touchinge the diſhonour, the contumelies and re-  
 proches done to Biſhoppes, that redounde alſo to Chriſt,  
 as he him ſelfe witneſſeth, ſaynge: He that diſpiſeth  
 you, diſpiſeth me. Sir it is alſo written in the holie  
 Scriptures: that he, that reſiſteth the ſuperiour po- Rom. 13.  
 wer, reſiſteth God, whiche I am ſure is ſpoken of  
 Princes, and other Magiſtrates: wherefoze your Pope  
 and his Popiſhe Biſhoppes, ſo longe rebellinge againſt  
 theſe Princes, are to be warned hereof. But as foze  
 this tezte by you alleaged, it was not ſpoken to your  
 Pope, noz Popiſhe Biſhoppes. It was ſpoken to thoſe Luc. 10.  
 who ſhoulde teach the Goſpell, whiche they had recei- Math. 28.  
 ued of Chriſte: and in dede, they that deſpiſe thoſe,  
 that teach Chriſtes Goſpell, deſpiſe Chriſte, whoſe Docete q̄ p̄ce-  
 Goſpell it is. And this one exception is enough to de- pi vobis.  
 barre the Popes, and all his Biſhoppes, from the clay-  
 ming of this tezte, as apperteininge to them, who do  
 not onely, not preache Chriſtes Goſpell, but alſo moſt  
 cruelly murder them that do preache it. For I wyl  
 not here encomber you with the reſt of the exceptions:  
 as that they, to whom this tezte was ſpoken, were Luc. 10.  
 ſente as Lambes amongſt Wolves, but your Pope &  
 his Biſhoppes come like Wolves amongſt Lambes. And  
 what ſhoulde I ſpeake of no purſes, noz wallettes, no  
 ſhewes, noz ſtaues, to thoſe y have huge cheſtes full of  
 treaſure, ſaundalles of goulde, and ſette with pre-  
 cious ſtones, Halberdes, Poiſpikes, yea Piſtoletes,  
 Halcehakes, Gonnes, and double Cannons, &c. I pray  
 See you

you search the text better **P. Dozman**: I thinke you shal not finde the men you speake of, mentioned in all that chapter, where this text is.

And where your **Pope** and his **Prelates** haue so honorable rowmes, and lininges given them, by the liberalitie of **Princes**, and others, with muche reuerence exhibited vnto them, farre passing the double honour, that **S. Paule** saith a godlie **Prelate** is worthe of, though it be but senglie, and simple deserued of their partes: Is this honour too litle, that you count your **Pope** dishonoured, vnlesse the greatest **Princes** of the earth doe hold his bydle, stay his stirroppe, kisse his secte (whiche honour none the poorest subiect exhibiteth vsuallie to the highest **Prince**) would his holines be kisset any lower, would he haue his secte vpon all **Emperours**, **Kynges**, and **Princes** neckes, as he once serued the noble and most valiant **Emperour Frederike Anobarbe**? Are not suche wealthy **kinges**, and **lordlie estates**, as your **Papish Prelates** haue of **Princes** gistes, honour enough vnto them: but that they must also in matters of **Religion**, whiche toucheth the health of their soules, & heauenlie kingdome, beleaue and folowe whatsoeuer they say, though mosse manifestlie repugnaunt to **Gods** holie woorde, without whics or whattes, without any searchinge, or dissenting: or elles they be dishonored, and reproched with contumelies, and the same dishonour, and **God** will, must redounde to **Christe** also? Is it not enough for your **Pope**, by his extreme tyrannie, and his **Prelates**, by their false treason, to haue deposed so manie godlie **Christian Emperours**, **Kynges**, and **Princes**: and to haue deppriued them of their worldly **kingdomes**, vna  
 les

**Pigh. Hierarch.**  
 lib. 6. cap. 13.  
 Ho. li. 2. fo. 118.  
 Dor. sup. fo. 23.  
 D. Hard. Cōfut.  
 Apolo. fol. 302.  
 &. 304.

lesse they may be suffered to depriue them of the kingdome of heauen also: Or els, the Pope and his Prelates are dishonoured, and their dishonour also doth rebounde to Christ him selfe forsooth. Well, I trust that Christian Princes one daie will awake from their long sleepe, and looke about them, howe they may honour and adourne accordinge to their vertues and merites your Pope, and popish Prelates, thus pitifully by you complayning, that they lacke their due honour, and are dishonoured by vndue contumelies and reproches: vnto whome we wishe that they may amends, and become woorthie of some parte of that honour, whiche they too muche haue, or elles be honoured, as they in deede doo deserue.

Ornare ex suis  
virtutibus.

Dorman. Fol. 40.

The which thing I would to God our aduersaries which glorie so much of the name of Christians, vaunte them selues of the knowlege of the gospel, would not thinke scorne to learne by the exaple of a Pagane and Infidel. I meane Alexander the great. VVho although he were by religio an ethnike, by nature intollerable proud, so that not contented as Quintus Curtius writeth of him, to be borne of the race of mortall men, he conueighed his petigrue from the Gods, not sufferinge but commaundinge also, that vpon peine of his indignation all men shoulde call him the sonne of Iupiter: and to increase the more that naughtie humour of his, and to poure as the prouerbe is. oile into the fier, by fortune so happy, that the whole worlde was in a manner, by the dent of his sworde conquered and brought vnder, that at his name the proudest Tirants trembled, and barbarous nations stooped: he yet all this notwithstandinge, beinge such and so mightie a Monasche, when on a time he shoulde entre into

Translated word  
for woorde, out  
of Hof. lib. 1. fo.  
40. 2.

See 2

the

A REPROVE OF M. G.

the citie of Ierusalem, as sone as he once perceined Iaddus the highe Iosephus  
 priest comminge to wardes him, fell downe and reuerenced him. antiq. II  
cap. 16.  
 Whereat when Parmenio one of his trustie friendes maruelinge Origin.  
tra Cell  
lib. 5.  
 not a little, had demaunded of him, why he whom all osher men  
 woorshipped, and had in reuerence, did woorship the prince of  
 Ierwis he priestes: his ans were was, that he woorshipped not him, Alexand  
reueren  
toward  
high pr  
 but God whose ministre he was.

Nowell.

This stufte is  
 borowed out of  
 Hosius floore.  
 lib. 1. cōtra Brē-  
 zium fol. 40.

Yea, now you play the wise man M. Dozman, see  
 inge you haue thziuen so euill by the Scripture, to take  
 you to Quintus Curtius, as god an authour for that  
 Diuinitie whereof you are Bachelor, as possible may  
 be. Wherefoze you haue done right well, so painfull-  
 ly to penne, and to floozthe with your fine Rhetorical  
 flowzes this Curtian hystorie. The effecte whereof is.

Nanclerus ge-  
 nerations. 40.

That Emperours, Kinges, and Princes, must  
 fall downe, vppon their knes, I doubt, or flatte vpon  
 their faces, for it is not expresse in the texte, befoze  
 our holie Father the Pope, and reuerence, and woors-  
 shippe him: and then say you, they woorship not him,  
 but God. Why sir, but Frederike the Emperour solo-  
 winge your Curtian example, and fallinge flatte vpon  
 his face befoze the seate of Pope Alexander the thirde,  
 and salowinge your lesson also, and saynge, he exhibi-  
 tited not that great submission, to Pope Alexander,  
 but to S. Peter, was for the saide sayng well fauou-  
 redlic soulted in the necke by the Pope with his feete,  
 who repliyng saide: Both to me, & to Peter. Where-  
 foze I thinke it better after this lowe curtelle, that you  
 speake of, is maide, to vse the Popes owne phrase and  
 figure of speache, rather than yours of not woorship-  
 pinge

pringe him, but God: vnlesse a man haue a lust to haue his nose beaten against the grounde, as flatte to his face, as a pancake.

In some, you see good Readers, what honour it is, that the Pope and his pzelates lacke nowe adales, by the whiche lacke, Chyiste is also dishonoured, as is finally concluded by a corollarie out of Quintus Curtius. But I maruell muche that M. Dozman omitted the example of Cornelius, fallinge downe at Peters feete, and woozshipping him: for this beinge Scripture, had bene moze make for him, beinge a Bachelor of Diuinitie: and it toucheth the case directly, that was thus done to S. Peter, the Popes firste pzedecessour, as due to him also by succession pardie. Peradventure M. Dozman either remembred not, or elles fearinge that Cornelius example woulde not so muche further the case, as Peters example, forbiddinge any such woozshippinge to be doone to him, would hinder it: and not onely disgrace his Curtian corollarie, but vtterly controule the intollerable arrogancie of the Pope, who beyng I will not saye how muche inferiour to S. Peter, but vsually, scarsely an honest man, admitteth Emperours and Kinges, muche superiours to a Centurion, or poore pette Captaine, as was Cornelius, not onely to a lowe curtesse, but also to the kissinge of his shooe. M. Dozman might also haue used the example of Attila that barbarous & cruell Tyrant, humilitie, towarde Pope Leo: for that toucheth the case directly, and was as easilie to be founde in Hosi-  
us in the very same place. But M. Dozman like a reasonable and shamefaffe bozower, woulde not take all at once, or elles feared he should be espyed, if he made  
suche

Paulus Diaconus lib. 15.

such hauoke: and therefore thought it better to pike and  
glean here and there.

Dorman. Fol. 40.

By this whiche herherto good Readers you haue harde, foras-  
much as it appeareth, that our aduersaries stand altogether destitue  
and as it were naked, of such prouisiō out of the scriptures, as with  
the vaine title whereof, they perswaded them selues their parte to  
be well bouldred, and them selues against all that would mainteine  
the contrary, sufficient by furnished: it remaineth now, that I first  
bringe forth to you such examples, as hauinge happened in Christs  
Churche sence his departure hence and his Apostles, they alleage for  
them selues: then asier, that I resell the same, and proue that they  
make as little or lesse for their purpose, as doo the other before  
brought forth of the scriptures.

Example  
brought  
the prot  
stante.

Nowell.

You see good Readers, what a spoile of vs y man hath  
made, & how naked he hath left vs of all prouission out  
of the Scriptures, and now he leauing vs starke naked  
on that side, maketh his transition from this spoile like  
a large conquerour, to an other spoile, and to his refel-  
linge of our examples and prouises taken out of histo-  
ries Ecclesiasticall of the Christian Churche: whiche he  
professeth he wil proue to make as litle for our purpose,  
as doo the other befoze brought out of the Scripture.  
And I thinke you shal finde it partly as he saith, that he  
will refute the one, as he hath already done the other  
parte, and that you shal finde him no chaungelinge, in  
handlinge of his matters.

Dorman. Folio. 41.

And first for Constantinus the great, although by consent of all  
historiographers it be well known and moste apparent, (as before  
hath byn showed) how farre he was of all or her, from that vnlau-  
fulle

fulle

Late victor.  
Salmacida spo-  
lia

full desire of entremedding in matters of Religion; yet for asmuch as the impudency of these men is such, that they are not as hamed to abuse his name amongest other, for the maintenauce of their opinion, and that they labour to make him a pillar to susteine and holde vp their rotten buildinge, alleaginge his callinge together of the Councell of Nice, his sitting there presently with the Bishoppes and fathers, his admonishinge them how to procede, that is accordinge to the doctrine of the Prophetes and Apostles: I will firste as weare thereunto, and after procede to the reste.

Constantinus the true is, called together to the rooting out and utter extirpation of the heresie of Arius, that great and famousse councell of Nice, as after him did diuerse other good Emperours, diuerse other. But neither of this acte of his, or that of theirs can any man rightly gather, that either the one or the other had ouer matters of Religion any thinge thereby the more auctoritie.

#### Nowell.

Constantine the Emperour had no vnlafulfull desire of intermedding in matters of Religion, but he did most lafully and often intermedle therein, as shal hereafter at large appeare. We may not disdaine to haue impudencie and shamelesnes laide to our charge, by so shamefaste & maidenlie a man, as is *D. Dorman*. And wher the controuersie is, whether Christian Princes haue authoritie as wel ouer persons Ecclesiasticall as in matters Ecclesiasticall, can your shamefastnes *D. Dorman* serue you to denie, but that this sommoninge and callinge of Bishops by Emperours, by you here confessed, proueth the one part, y<sup>e</sup> is, y<sup>e</sup> the Emperour hath authoritie ouer Bishops, who are persons Ecclesiasticall. You say it can not be gathered of this sommoning of Bishops to councelles by Emperours that they had any authoritie ouer matters of Religion.

But

A REPROVVE OF M.

But sir, we are neither in hande with treatise of maters, but with summoninge of persons Ecclesiastical: we shall come to maters Ecclesiastical shortly, and in due time, when they shall beginne to be entreated of in the Councell beinge assembled. And I doubt nothing, but it shall plainly appeare by these histories Ecclesiastical, whiche you affirme to make nothinge for our purpose, that Christian Princes had, and used chiefe authoritie, as wel ouer persons, and in maters Ecclesiastical: and withal it shall fall out, who be impudent or shamelesse, we or you.

Dorman. Folio. 41.

But euen as the handes or armes reachinge a thinge far of, A simile  
when it is brought neater to sight, nothing thereby the more au-  
thorised to iudge of the value and goodnesse thereof, to dispose how  
it shall be ordered, but that remaineth still in the head by whose  
councell and commaundement the handes and armes reached it thi-  
er: euen so in this case maie it be saide.  
rude.

No Well.

¶ Dorman, when examples of Princes authoritie ouer persons Ecclesiastical are in hande, woulde draw vs from persons, to maters Ecclesiastical. And he woulde proue by this similitude here, that the Emperour is but an hand or arme in this matter, onely commaunded (by what head you shall shortly heare) to reache thinges far of, and to bringe them neerer sight. And so he maketh the Bishops (whom other men call persons) in his phrase of speache, and similitude, to be thinges farre of, by the Emperours calling of them together, as by the handes, brought neerer sighte.

Againe

Againe the eyes that must see and see these things brought nearer, can be none other (I trowe) but the Bishops, and learned men: for S. Augustine saith even of Peter him selfe, who was y<sup>e</sup> chiefe, *Petrus erat oculus in capite*, Peter was the eye in the head. And so the Bishops in M. Dormans similitude, are both the things that are brought nere from farre of, and the eyes also to the sight and see of whome the things are brought. Soe that it muste needs be a verie prettie similitude, which yet liked M. Dorman so well, that he could not leaue it vnmarked in the margent. Nowe if M. Dorman will say that he speaketh of matters Ecclesiastical, and not of persons: surely he speaketh of somoning of Bishops to counsels. And if he will needs speake here of matters: howe matters in the counsell to be treated of, should be saue of, or howe they may by the Emperour be brought nearer to sight. M. Dormans sight may serue him to decerne, better than mine. If it perhaps may please M. Dorman, to make the Emperour in the counsell, as the speaker in the lower house of the parliamēt, to moue matters, and so to bring them to sight: we are not yet so farre soe ward, but about y<sup>e</sup> assembling ourselves, and it were perillous also to geue the Emperour so highe an office, lest perhaps he might chalēge the chiefe rowne and authoritie in the house. But M. Dorman doth prosecute his similitude.

*Dorman, Fol. 41.*

*In Christes Church there is, and as it hath bene before proued necessarily must be one head.*

*No well.*

*Before proued necessarilike, q<sup>d</sup> he, nay miserablē proued for the Pope and Papistes parte, & shamefully too,*

*¶¶¶*

*as eue*

as euer was any thing proued, and as ridiculouſſe and effectuously to make ſport, as euer did **D.** Doz man ante thing in all his life, when he playeth his part beſt.

*Dorman. Fol. 41.*

As there is an head, ſo is there a bodie, armes, legges, and o-ther members anſwering to the ſame.

*No well.*

This is well and truly ſaid, and is a maior verſe meete for the matter.

*Dorman fol. 41.*

Emongest the whiche, Princes and Kinges haue of our elders nor omiſſe, bene termed the hâdes and armes to aide and ſuccour the head.

*No well.*

This minor would haue bene proued, & it ſhuld haue bene ſhewed what elders they be, & where they ſo haue ſaid, at the leaſt it would haue bene noted by a marke in the margent, where we might haue found ſome further prouſe hercof, than **D.** Doz mās onely ſaiyng. For I might with better reaſon ſay that **C.** Conſtantine was the head, that commanded the armes or handes, ſeing it is by the hiſtozte moſt euident, (and is alſo by **D.** Doz man confeſſed) that he ſommoned and called all the Biſhops to the counſell of Nice.

*Dorman. Fol. 41.*

If now the Biſhoppes of Rome for the time being (for they are vnder Chriſt the true heades of this church, as hereafter by Goddes grace I ſhall make it moſt manifellie appeare) haue emongest ſo manie enemies and backe friendes as Chriſt and his goſpell had, bene glad to bid their handes doe their duetie, to call to the Emperours and Kinges for helpe whiche had ſo longe hindered

*if by*

if by this meanes they compelled them to comme in for feare of the temporall sword, who feared not the spirituall: if they vsed this rigorouse meanes where lenitie could haue no place: who is so voyde of witte to thinke, that princes had thereby auctoritie ouer Religion?

Nowell.

Nowe you see the head of the Church (that should commaunde this arme the Emperour) is the Bishoppe of Rome: and that will he make hereafter mooste manifestlie appeare. No doubt as manifestlie, as he befoze proued effectiuoulie, that there must of necessitie be one head of Christes vniuersall Church: and that shall you by Gods grace see mooste manifestlie appeare.

But in the meane season S. Augustine (as I haue noted a litle befoze) calleth Peter not the head, but the eye in the head. Wherefoze I maruell that the Pope, who hath all his headshippe of S. Peter, should be greater than Peter him selfe. And if this head (saith he) commaunded Emperours and Kinges (as the head biddeth the handes and called to them for helpe in the assemblinge of suche counsels: if by this meanes he compelled those to comme in for feare of the Temporall sword, who feared not the spirituall: if they vsed this rigorous meanes &c. who is so voyde of witte (saith D. Dorman) to thinke that Princes had thereby auctoritie ouer Religion? Surely D. Dorman there is no man so voyde of witte, I thinke, but he will thinke it is good reason, that you shuld haue shewed by some one or other example, whā, where, & by what wordes, the Bishops of Rome haue commaunded Emperours and Kinges in the assemblee of counsels (as the head biddeth the handes, or armes doo their dueties) scinge the same is a matier of suche weight, and so much making for you, and against vs: &

August. tract. 13  
in Iohannem.

not to haue gone to worke with so manie Pffes, and neuer an one of them pꝛoued, seing you haue graunted alreadie most plainlie, without any yf at all, that the Bishops were assembled and called to counsell by the Emperours sommoning, whiche soundeth directly for his authozitie, and contrarie to that you now say. And specially should you haue shewed where, and what commaundement Constantine the Emperour receiued from the Bishop of Rome, for the assemble of this great Picens counsell, seing it is the spectall ex ample that you haue chosen nowe to treat of: at the least you should haue noted in the margent (as you do manie trifflinge things) where we might haue sought for it: and not thus continuallie to laie your credit to gage to vs, to trust you still vpon your pooze honestie, & that, though you say things moste contrarie. But I beleaue that there is no man vnlesse he be voide of all witt, and experience of your proprietie, and too forgetful of your pꝛoemes made (that you would bring in all your euidence into the face of open court) but he will thinke if you could haue brought anie euidence into the face of open Court for this matter, you would haue done it: and that therefore onelie you haue not done it, because you had none to shew: as shal hereafter most plainely appeare. Surelie your author Hosius often making mention of the Picens counsell, doeth graunt it to haue bene assembled by the Emperour Constantinus: but noe where (that I can yet finde) doeth he make mention of anie the Bishoppe of Romes commaundement, or dealing therein, whiche you may be sure, he would not haue omitted, could he haue founde any suche euidence. For your euidence is suche, as no man but you, would bringe in.

Your

Dot. sup. fo. 17.

No. li. 2. fo. 113. a  
& li. 4. fo. 187. a.

Your similitude may be applied to any persons or purposes, at pleasure. Your yffes, are false surmises, oft supposed, neuer proued. Your graunt is plaine, that Emperours sommoned and called Bishoppes to Councils: which as I take for a confession of their authoritie ouer Bishoppes, being persons Ecclesiasticall: so will I further proue the same, by those histories Ecclesiasticall, whiche you say make nothinge for our purpose.

Eusebius, after he had shewed y the dissentions amongst the Christians, and specially Bishoppes, about the heresie of Arius, and the feast of Easter, were exceedinge great, in so muche that they were like to murther eiche other: & y no mortall man could finde any remedie for so great a mischeaue, but y it was God onely, who might and that easilie remedie those euels, he saith thus: Solus inter eos qui terram incolebant Constantinus comparuit, qui Deo ad bona huiusmodi perficienda ministraret. that is: Amongst them, that dwelled vpon the earth, saith Eusebius, onely Constantine appeared, who might be Goddes minister in the finishinge of so good thinges. These are Eusebius his owne wordes. And here may you see M. Doorman, that had the Emperour Constantine not intermedled in those maters and controuersies of Religion, as you would haue it, they could by Eusebius his iudgement not haue bene compounded by any other man. And behoulde how farre your iudgement swaruethe fro the Iudgement of Eusebius, whom you alleage for your authour: you would haue the Emperour to haue nothinge to doe at all in maters of Religion: Eusebius saith that no other mortall man at all, but onely the Emperour, could goe through with the compoundinge of the greatest controuersies, that euer

Eusebius de vita  
Constantini lib. 3.  
ca. 188. c. & 189. a.

Nec quisq̄ esset  
hoim qui malo  
huic medela in-  
uenire posset.

yet were in our Religion. And that neither the Bishop of Rome, nor other Bishoppe, nor any mortall man, but the Emperour Constantinus alone, & none but he was Goddes minister, not in meddling onely with these things, (which you forbid him) but in goinge through with them, and finishinge them. And surely, had the Bishop of Rome bene than taken for the onely head of Chyistes Church in earth, Eusebius would neuer have thus spoken of Constantine, with such silence of y<sup>e</sup> saide Bishoppe. And though this be but Eusebius his entrie into y<sup>e</sup> treatise of the Nicene councell, & first of y<sup>e</sup> summoning of the same, yet may it serue not onely for y<sup>e</sup> authority of the Emperour in the said summoning of the Bishops to the Councell, & beginning with the controuersies Ecclesiasticall, but also for the going through with them, & perfect determining & finishinge of the said controuersies & matiers Ecclesiasticall. Eusebius proceedeth.

Ad bona huiusmodi proficienda.

Eusebius de vita  
Constantini lib. 3.  
fz. 189. a.

Secum ipse hanc  
re reputans &c.

Proinde quasi  
agmen Dei ad  
expeditionē du-  
cur<sup>9</sup> Synodum  
Aecumenicū col-  
legit & episco-  
pos, vt vndique  
acceleraret, ho-  
norificis literis  
conuocauit.  
Edicam hoc.

& saith: Constantinus vbi dictorum rumorem percepit. &c. Whan Constantinus the Emperour saith Eusebius, vnderstood of the contentions Ecclesiasticall, and y<sup>e</sup> his letters sent to them of Alexandria, had profited nothing: he weighing & consideringe the matter with himselfe, said, y<sup>e</sup> this battel against the obscure enemy troubleinge the Church was by an other to be finished. And therefore, as a Captaine that should lead Goddes arme on warrefare; he assembled an vniuersall councell, and with honorable letters called the Bishoppes together from all places, willing them to make haste. Which commaundement whan it came to the said Bishops, they al, with al readines & speade, came together. Thus far are Eusebius wordes, truelle translated. See M. Dozman, Eusebius saith not that Constantine assembleth the Councell

Conncell vpon the Bishop of Romes commaundement, as you surmise, but vpon the weighing and consideration of the matier with him selfe: and that as well to wey a matier of suche weight, as also to commaunde so many Bishops, is the proprietie of the head rather than y arme, as you would make the Emperour, in your similitude. Further you see y Eusebius copareth those thre hundred godly & learned Bishops, whiche came to the Nicene counsell, to an armie of Souldiars, & calleth the Goddes armie: but the Emperour Constantine he compareth to the Captaine of the armie, who gathereth the Souldiars together, & leadeth or guideth them. And the Emperours letters of sommoning of the coucell he calleth Edicta, & Mandata, Proclamations, iniunctions, pæcepts or commaundements: and he saith y the Emperour commaunded the Bishops to make haste to come together. And the Bishops vpon the knowlege of y Emperours commaundement, did by & by make all possible hast. And Theodoretus saith: y there came together, as many as were habile to susteine the labour, & trauaile of the iourney: & that such, as were not habile, sent some for their excuse, & in their place. And y Emperour, saith he, whā he vnderstood y al y Bishops were assembled, came last of al him selfe. Will you M. Doorman here say, y the Captaine is inferiour to the Souldiars: or y he who getteth out Edicta, & Mandata, pæcepts, or commaundements is inferiour to them, to whome they are geuen, & who doe readely obey y same: And whā one commaundeth a sort of hundred persons to assemble, and y with haste, to a place & at a time, by him selfe appointed, wherunto y most parte muste come by longe iourneies, with great trauaile, charges, & daungers, & with great tediousnes & charges

Edicta.

Mandata.

Lib. 3. de vita

Cōstāt. fa. 189. a.

&amp; lib. 4. fa. 210. b

Euseb. de vita

Constant. lib. 3.

fa. 189.

Mox oēs velut

carcere recluso,

cū omni animi

alacritate accur-

rerunt.

Theodoret. li. r.

histor. Ecclesiast.

cap. 7.

Quotquot via  
laborem pote-  
rant perficere.

charges also there remaine: & none to be absent, but such as for age, sickenes, or other lawfull impediment could not indure the traualle of the iourney: and he that commaunded all other, not comminge vntill he vnderstode all other, according to his commaundement, were come: Will you I say, haue him that so commaüdeth, or them that are so commaunded, superiours in this case: Will you haue the that so attende, or him vpon whome they attend, to be superiour: In the summoning of a parliament, are the nobles and Bishoppes summoned therto, the chiefe, or the Prince that summoneth them, god M. Dozman: In geuing out of a Proclamatio, is y<sup>e</sup> Prince, in whose name, and by whose authoritie it is made superiour: or his subiectes, to whome it is made: And whereas this, summoninge of Bishops by Emperours (by M. Dozman confessed) is in suche effectuous sorte, & with such authoritie, by the saide Emperours made (as in the histories appeareth) not to a tempozall Court, to entreate and debate of tempozall matiers, but to a coucell, to deliberate of matiers Ecclesiasticall, is there no probabilitie, that he who so summoneth suche Ecclesiasticall persons, to the treatie of Ecclesiasticall matiers, in a Court Ecclesiasticall, should haue authoritie him selfe, as ouer the saide persons Ecclesiasticall, (which is most manifest) so also in the saide Court, and matiers Ecclesiasticall: euen as the Prince, summoninge his Nobles and Bishoppes to a tempozall Court, for tempozall causes, hath authoritie not onely ouer those persons, but also in that Court, & in those matiers: which I say here, for that M. Dozman is so desirous to drawe vs from the consideration of Princes authoritie, ouer persons Ecclesiasticall in summoninge of them, here so plainely,

plainely, and pitheily proued, to their authoritie in matiers of Religion, not yet touched. But for the authoritie of Princes in matiers of Religion, you shall haue most euident euidence in due place hereafter.

Now peculiarly touchinge the Bishop of Rome: as there is not one worde in these, or any ancient histozie Ecclesiasticall, soundinge of any his biddinge or commaunding of the Emperour in this case, as you doe surmise: so is there euident declaracion, that the Emperour by his owne onely authoritie called the together: and that the Bishoppe of Rome was with others summoned to the saide counsell, and causes showed, why he came not him selfe, but sent his Deputies for him. For as Eusebius saith, that of all earthly men Constantinus alone was to be founde, that might serue God in this matter: so saith Socrates, that onely Constantinus the Emperour by bringing together that assemble of Bishoppes, made a certaine Image and shewe of the copantie of the Apostles. The Emperour him selfe likewise, before the whole numbze of Bishops, being in the counsell assembled, saith: Hoc mihi prater sp̄e accidit, q̄ tantum sacerdotum Christi numerū congregaui. That is to say: This thinge hath happened to me besides my hope, that I haue gathered together so great a numbze of the Bishoppes of Chyriste. The whole Nicene Council also, in their Epistle writen to the Churches of Alexandria, Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, doth testifie the same, by these very wordes: By the grace of God, and the most godly Emperour Constantine, who hath gathered vs together from diuers cities, and prouinces: the great and holy Synode is assembled at Nicæa. These be the wordes of the whole Council.

Socrates lib. 7.  
cap. 8. fa. 269. b.  
Solutus à seculo  
Cōstātin⁹ Imperator, hāc nobis  
Apostolici chori  
Imaginē, constituit.

Sozom. lib. 1. ca.  
19. fa. 558. c.

Socrat. lib. 1. c. 9.  
Per gratiam Dei  
& pietissimum  
Imperatorē Cōstāntinum, &c.

Now you see, Eusebius saith, Constantine alone was to be found, who might serue God herein. Socrates saith, onely Constantine assembled the Council. The Emperour him selfe, befoze the whole Council saith, I called together this your holy Synode or Coucell. The whole council it selfe testifieth, that it was assembled by the grace of God, and by the godly Emperour. None of all these, noz no other, maketh any mention, that the Bishop of Rome had herein any authoritie, or any thinge at all to do. And all men may easelie see, that if the Bishoppe of Rome his authoritie herein, had bene chiefe (as M. Dozman affirmeth) it should not with such silence haue bene passed ouer, by all these writers. Sozomenus declareth the same summoninge of this Council moze largely, thus. Cum vero institutum hoc Imperatoris conceptæ spei non respondisset &c. that is to say: When this attempte of the Emperour went not forwarde accordinge to his hope, and they, who were at contention, could not be agreed, and he, who was sent to make peace, was now returned, the Emperour called together a Synode or Council to be kept at Nicæa in Bithinia: and he did write to all the presidentes of Churches (that is to say to all Bishoppes) euery where, that they shoulde be present, at the day appointed. And the Bishoppes of the Apostolike sees were also called to the saide Synode, or Council: Pacharius the Bishoppe of Hierusalem, and Eustathius Bishoppe of Antiochia, and Alexander Bishoppe of Alexandria: but Julius the Bishoppe of the Romanes, because of his age, came not; but in his name and steede, Vitus (or Victor) and Vincentius Priestes of the Church of Rome were present. Thus farre Sozomenus truely

translates.

Sozom. li. i. c. 17.

Omnib<sup>9</sup> vbiq<sup>ue</sup>  
ecclesiarū præsi-  
dib<sup>9</sup> scripsit, &c.

franklate. And of the Bishoppe of Rome Socrates witnesseth the same. Here may you see M. Dozman, first <sup>Lib. 1. cap. 8. fol. 269. b.</sup> the Emperours care, and intermedling also in the greatest matiers and controuersies of Religion, that were betwene Alexander Bishoppe of Alexandria and Arius the Archeheretique: so; thereof speaketh Sozomenus. You see also that whan he coulde not sette them at vnitie, he called together all y<sup>e</sup> p<sup>r</sup>æsidentes of Churches, or Bishoppes, whiche were enough to shew that the Bishoppe of Rome also was called, seinge he was p<sup>r</sup>æsident of a Church, or a Bishoppe: but if that will not serue you, he saithe further, that the Bishoppes of the Apostolike sees were also called to the same Council: and he reckoneth foure, Hierusalem, Antiochia, Alexandria, and Rome in this very orde: which well serueth you M. Dozman, who are wonte of the ordrs in a reherfall to make a great matter, and of the firste place therein to gather the chiefe p<sup>r</sup>æminence.

Besides that, the Bishop of Rome hath there no other title but onely, Bishop of the Romaines: which is very inconuenient at suche a pointe of time, wherein his vniuersall iurisdiction, (had he than had any) shoulde chiefly haue bene exercised. And Sozomenus and Socrates doo shewe, that age (not authozitie) staid the saide Bishop of Rome, that he came not, at the Emperours commaundement, as did the other Patriarkes, but sente his Deputies so; him. The case standinge thus, you come in M. Dozman, and say *If nowe the Bishop of Rome as the head did call vpon the Emperour and bidd him as the bande to doo his duetie. these are your wordes: where it is most euident, that the Emperour did call vpon the Bishoppe of Rome, and did bidde him doo his duetie in*

Julius Romanorū episcopus.

Euseb. lib. 3. de  
vita Cōstantini.  
fa. 192. &c. & lib.  
4. fa. 210. &c.  
Theodor. lib. 1.  
cap. 7.  
Sozom. lib. 1.  
cap. 17. 19. & 2.  
cap. 28. 29.  
Synodū cōuoca-  
bat, cōgregabat,  
coegit, quasi ex-  
ercitum Dei, ar-  
mauit, in expe-  
ditionē duxit,  
cōuenire, adesse,  
iussit, mox, sine  
aliqua dilatiōe,  
statim, visis li-  
teris suis, vt ma-  
turarent, literis  
Imperatoris vr-  
gens & impellēs  
Synodū vt ma-  
turarent &c.  
Euseb. lib. 10.  
hīstor. cap. 5,  
fol. 154. b.  
Maturarunt, ac-  
currerūt, cōcur-  
rerunt oēs velut  
carcere recluso,  
cū omni animi  
alacritate, &c.

comminge to the Councell, and that by age he was ex-  
cused that he came not. The wōrdes and termes vled  
in the Emperours sommoninge and callinge of the Bi-  
shoppes together, to this and other Councelles (foz he  
assembled diuers other Synodes) are these: The Em-  
perour called together, gathered together, assembled,  
he armed, as it were, the Synode of many Bishoppes,  
he led the Synode of the Bishoppes, as it were a Cap-  
taine, that ledde Goddes armie into warrefare: he com-  
maunded them to come together, & to be present with-  
out any delay, sozthwith, vpon the sight of his letters:  
hastely callinge vpon, and dꝛiuinge (as it were) foze-  
warde the Synode, with the Emperours letters to  
make hast. These & such like be the Phrases & wōrdes,  
vled by those authours Ecclesiastical, and by the Empe-  
rour him selfe: whiche, whether they be wōrdes of com-  
maundement, as geuen from the head: oꝛ of the arme,  
commaunded to dō his duetie, as M. Dozman saith, let  
the reasonable Readers iudge. And the wōrdes & phra-  
ses of the Bishops parte, are these, and such like. Whē  
the Bishoppes had intelligence of the Emperours wil,  
and commaundement, by and by, withall spꝛede, and rea-  
dines, they came together: oꝛ as the Latine wōrdes dō  
founde, they came runninge together, as it were men  
letten out of a pꝛison, oꝛ runninge a rase. Whether these  
phrases agree so peculiarlie to either heades, oꝛ eies, as  
M. Dozma in his similitude would haue it, oꝛ in similitu-  
de of speech, dō appertaine rather to y<sup>e</sup> inferior me-  
mbres, and partes of the bodie, let the discrete Reader also  
iudge. Thus, foz that M. Dozman hath charged vs with  
such impudencie, that we are not ashamed to vse the name of this  
godly Emperour Constantine for the maintenaūce of our opiniō &c.

I haue

I have thought good of infinite places in the histories Ecclesiasticall, to touche some, whiche do declare the said Emperours authoritie ouer Bishoppes in summoning them to councelles, and amongst them, the Bishop of Rome: so that all men may see, how that false usurper of Rome, hath creapt of late into the possession of the ancient, and originall right of Christian Emperours and Princes. And withall, haue, I trust discharged vs of such impudencie, as M. Dozman chargeth vs withall, for the vsing of the example of Constantinus the Emperour, for this first point of summoning of Bishoppes to councelles. And I shall not faile to do the like in al other poinces, wherein M. Dozman likewise, and moze vehemently also, chargeth vs for vsinge the name, and authoritie of the said godlie Emperour Constantinus to our purpose.

Dorman. Fol. 41.

Nay but Constantinus (saith our apologie) did not onelie call together the councell of Nice, but he sat in the same with the Bishops, nor sat there barelie as a cipher, but warned them howe to procede by the scriptures. Here marke diligentlie I beseeche you good readers, either the manifest malice of them that wittinglie mangle the holie histories, or intollerable felishenes whiche alleage that that they neuer them selues sawe, but onely haue by report of others: or last of all their grosse ignorance, that thinke they haue to doe with them, who without anie farder searching of suche places as are by them alleaged, will streight waies giue full credit to their bare honesties. Eusebius who writeth the historie of Constantinus, and whole discours of his life, witnesseth, that comming into the councell last of all, hauing prepared readie for him a seate lower then anie of the rest: he would not before sit down in the same, then first

Hos<sup>o</sup>. li. 2. fo. 113

D. Hard. Cōfut.

Apolo. fo. 314. 2.

hath the same.

both borowed it

of Ho. li. 2, fo. 113.

Egg 3

he had.

he had asked of the Bishops and they graunted him licence so to doe: the bish  
 The verie same doeth sacraes report of him, and euen he our before I  
 of whome the apologie allegeth this example, Theodoretus himselfe had ask  
 whose wordes are these, *Minoris vero sedis quam alijs posita, so to de*  
*in medio eorum sedit, primo tamen petens sibi hoc episcopo- Li. i. ca*  
*rum iulsiōne concedi. And hauing (that is to saye) appointed for Hist. ecc*  
 him a place or seate meaner then any of the other, he sat him downe trip. lib  
 in the middelt of them, desiring yet first, that by the commaundement cap. 5.  
 of the Bishoppes it might be graunted him so to doe. If this be true  
 (as if the histories and olde. recordes doe not witnes the same then  
 let me neuer be farder beleued) what meaneth this lieng generation  
 to bring in for example, to susteine and vphold their wicked doctrine,  
 this vertuous emperour Constantinus? then whome if they would  
 haue laied all their heades together for that purpose, they should  
 neuer haue founde one, whose doings and whole life had made  
 more for vs, or more against them.

Looke vppon  
 D. Hard. Cōfut.  
 Apolo. fo. 314.

If he were chief of the counsell, and ruled all as they saie, why  
 had he in that place (where by all likelihood there lacked nothing  
 that pertained to semelic ordre) a seate lesse statelic then his inferi-  
 ours? Places are I knowe of their owne nature thinges indifferent  
 and of no greate account. Yeat haue they at all times, in all ages,  
 and emongest all men, bene taken for meanes to distinct accordinge  
 to their worthines in degree, one from an other. so that it can be to  
 no man doubtfull, but that, if of the counsell gathered and assembled  
 together he had bin the head and chiefe, there should haue bin pre-  
 pared for him, if not a seate suche as might by the maiestie aboue  
 the rest well haue declared the same; yet at the least suche a one, as  
 should not by the basenes thereof compared with thother, well and  
 plainelic haue proued the contrarie. If the whole some and order of  
 religion belonged to him being the emperour: why then in that place  
 whither they were all for that purpose (to entreate of religion)  
 assembled, had the head of that parte no place but by licence? Why  
 asked

asked he leave of the Bishoppes to sit in the counsell and not rather  
they of him?

Nowell.

I thinke verely that I haue declared sufficient eui-  
dence to proue the Emperours superiortie ouer the bi-  
shops in the calling of them to the counsell. Now where  
M. Dozman doeth so greauouslie yet againe charge vs,  
with either manifest malice, as mangling the holie histories: or in-  
tolerable foolishnes, that we doe alleage that, whiche we neuer  
sawe: or grosse ignorance, that knowe not with what maner of  
men we haue to doe: to witte, with suche profound and cir-  
cūspect clerkes, as M. Dozmā is one: who also calleth vs  
a lieng generation, and heapeth al kindes of reproches vpon  
vs: I doubt nothing but that al the said reproches,  
shall in thend rebound vpon his owne heade.

First M. Dozmā of a low chaire maketh here an high  
matter, wherunto, with the rest of his obiectiōs, I haue  
thought best to ground mine answer vpon the full and  
plaine recital of those histories, which M. Dozmā, & his  
maister D. Hard. haue in deede, most miserably mangled.  
Sozomenus in his Ecclesiastical historie, after he hath  
declared how the Emperour refusing to heare y<sup>e</sup> contro-  
uercies amongst the Bishops, burned all their billes of  
complaint (wherof I haue befoze entreated) saith thus.

Imperator diē determinauit, quo qua in questionē venerāt,  
solui deberēt &c. y<sup>e</sup> is to say. The emperour determined,  
or finally assigned a day, wher in the matters y<sup>e</sup> were in  
questiō, shuld be resolved vpon. But befoze y<sup>e</sup> day appoin-  
ted came, the Bishops assembling in a seueral place by  
them selues, did accuse Arins, & proponinge furth their  
myndes and opiniōs, did dispute. Thus saith Sozome-  
nus. And in the. xix. chapter folowinge, he saith:

Episcopi

Sup. fo. 69. 70.  
&c.

Sozome. histor.  
ecclesiast. li. 1. ca.  
17. c. & 19. a.

Determinauit  
diem.

Episcopi separa-  
ti cōgregati. &c.

Episcopi vero assidue conuenientes, Arium in medium adducebant &c. that is to saie: and the Bishops assembling still together, had Arius befoze them, & made diligent inquirie vpon his propositions. But they toke heede, that they did not too hastily geue sentence vpon ante side, or part. And when the day determined was come, where in according to y<sup>e</sup> appointmēt, the doubtles should be resolued vpon, the Bishops came together into the Palace, because it was the Emperours pleasure to be present at their consultation. When the Bishops therefore were assembled together into one place, the Emperour passing thzough the middle of the Bishops, to the head of the copanie, sat downe in a certē thzone, whiche was prouided for him, and than the Synode or Councell, was commaunded to sit downe. For there were by the walles on both sides of the palace manie seates: but this thzone (that the Emperour sat in) was greatest, and excelled the other seates. &c. These are Sozomenus his woordes truely translate.

Eusebius agreinge with Sozomenus in the day appointed, and in the description of the house and seates vpon both sydes, saith: that the Bishops beinge called, came in, and euerie one of them did take to him a conuenient place. And whan the whole Synode was in a comely order, all kept silence, lookinge for the Emperours comming. And first (saith Eusebius) came in some one of those, that were about the Emperour, than an other, than the thirde. And those that went befoze the Emperour, were not armed men, and of the garde, as was wonte, but of his friendes onely. And whan a signe beinge geuen of the Emperours comming in, they all were risen, than came he in the middle, as it were

Cauebāt autem  
ne in altervtram  
partē sententiā  
præcipitarent.

Ad caput cōuēt<sup>o</sup>  
in throno quo-  
dam qui ipsi pa-  
ratus erat con-  
sedit, &c.

Multa posita  
subsellia.  
Hic vero thron<sup>o</sup>  
maxim<sup>o</sup> erat, &  
reliquis sedes ex-  
cellerat.

Lib. 3. de vita  
Constan. fa. 189.  
Intus compare-  
bant vocati.  
Cum vero in de-  
centi esset orna-  
tu vniuersa sy-  
nodus.

were a certen heauenlie Angel, shining with purple, gould, and precious stones &c. When he came to the upper end of the orders of robes of the Bishops, he staid first, and a litle chaire made of golde matier, being set, he sate not downe, afoze the Bishoppes desired him, or made a signe to him, and after the Emperour all the Bishoppes sate likewise. Thus farre Eusebius truelie translate.

Priusquā ab episcopis annueret, quod & reliqui post Imperatorē uniuersi fecerunt.

Now Theodozistus, whome both D. Harding and M. Dozma alleage as most for their purpose, saith thus Cum autem uniuersi conuenissent &c. that is to say, When all the Bishops were come together, there was prepared, by the King a large place in the Palace of Court, set full of seates, and vnderseates, which might suffice the numbze of the Bishops: and so when he had done due honour or reuerence to the said Bishoppes, he commaunded them to entre in, and to cōsult of the matter appoinated. And he him selfe, with a fewe, came in last of all: and sate downe in a litle chaire there set, asking leaue first of the Bishops, and than al that godlike company sate downe also. These be Theodozetus his woozdes. In the whiche processe of these hystories, howe many thinges making notable, for the Emperours superosittie ouer the said Bishoppes. M. Dozman and his maister D. Harding haue by guilful silence dissembled, taking hould of the lownes of the chaire, and the Emperours curtesie in sittinge downe, the discrete Reader may of him selfe easely consider: and withall iudge, who they be that mangle the holte hystories. But for the Reader of meane vnderstanding his sake, I will out of these hystories Ecclesiasticall answere the principall pointes of their quarellings.

Theodorit. li. 2 cap. 7.

Instruct. sublelis & solijs.

Insiit eos introire, &c.

Praefatus veniam prius, & petita concessione ab episcopis.

Whh

M. Doz

**W. Dozman** here saith. *The Emperour came into the coun-  
cel last of all.* **D. Harding** frameth thereof this question.

**D. Hard. Cōfut.**  
Apolo. fo. 314. a-  
Insuper epos in-  
troire. &c.

Vocati  
comparuerunt.

Now thinke you that the supreme head of the Church should haue come in last and haue sitten beneath his subiectes &c. **Theo-  
dozitus** answereth: the **Bishoppes** were commaunded by the Emperour to goe in first, and to consult. **Euse-  
bius** answereth: they were called in first, and appeared, and that they toke their places, and settled them selves in good order, and with silence waited for the Empe-  
rours comminge, and with great reuerence stood by whan he came in, and passed through them all: and in this sort, it is vsual for the inferiours to come first, and to attend: and for the superiour to come after, at his lea-  
sure, and pleasure. Neither sate he as **D. Harding** set-  
teth, beneath them, but aboue them though in a lowe chaire. The lownes of the whiche chaire, as **D. Har-  
ding** wold not suffre it to escape him, so is it the highest point of all with **W. Dozman**, who translateth **Theo-  
dozitus** after this sort.

*Constantinus* hauing, that is to say, appointed for him, a place or seate, meaner than any of the other, he sate him downe in the midst of the. &c. Thus he translateth the wordes of **Theo-  
dozitus**: and after he saith. If this be not true, than let me neuer be farther beleaued. But, **W. Dozman**, **Theodozitus** maketh no mention of suche appointing, as you do speake of or meane. For you would beare the ignorant in hand, that by the **Bishops**, or some for the, that meaner seate was to the Emperour, as a meaner man, and their inferiour, appointed: but those godlie & humble **Bishops**, (most vnlike to your popish **Prælates**) had the appointed it, it should haue bene higher than any of theirs: as doth appeare by the procelle of the historie, declaring & humill-

humilitie of those godly and most toloke holy Bishops, wherein they did strive, as muche with the said Emperour, in all submission to him, as do now your Pope & his Prelates in all pride and p̄sumption, contend to be above al Kinges and Emperours. Wherefoze the hystoꝛie hath no suche mention of any appoynting of such a lower chaire foꝛ the Emperour, but that the chaire foꝛ the Emperour, as all the other seates foꝛ the Bishops also, were set by the Emperours owne appoyntment, in a large place in his Palace, whither he comaunded the Bishops (who befoze had their conference in an other place) to come, foꝛ ȳ he wold haue the hearing of ȳ matters him selfe. And as those godly Bishops, in all other thinges shewing humilitie, would not, so durste no Bishop noꝛ any other mā, appoynt ȳ lowest chaire to the Emperour in his owne Palace, and Court, oꝛ do any thing, tending to the abasing of the honour of soe high & glorious a Prince, as ever the world had. Lib. 1. cap. 7. But Theodozetus (whome both D. Hardinge & you alleage as most foꝛ your purpose) saith expꝛessly, that the Emperour appoynted the place, with all the seates therein. And if the Emperour appoynting all ȳ seates, appoynted ȳ lowest foꝛ him selfe, what could any mā (saunge only a proud Papisſt) gather therof, but the great humilitie, of so great a Prince, and Emperour: the same may I say concerning his curtesie in sitting downe.

But D. Dozman as befoze he was busie with the appoynting of a meaner seate foꝛ ȳ Emperour, as a meaner mā, so is he also busie in lasing ȳ Bishops comaundemēt vpon the Emperour: whereas in déede no such, either appoyntmēt, oꝛ comaundemēt, is in Theodozetus, oꝛ any other good ancient hystoꝛie, to be founde. And though I will not hinder him from his delight herein,

yet would I aduertise him thereupon, not to vse too often suche solempne protestations: that if the histories, and ould recordes doe not witnes the same, than let me (saith M. Doz- man) neuer be farther beleaued. These are your wordes. And if you, thus doinge, will needes thus protest, you may happen to obtaine your request, and such credit, as you both desire and deserue. For neither Theodozetus maketh mention of any suche commaundemet, and your maister D. Harding, who had rather finde than lase, could finde no suche commaundemet, as you talke of: as may by these his wordes appeare. *Thinke you that the supreme head of the Church, should haue staid to sit, vntill they had, as it were geuen him leaue?*

D. Hard. Cōfur.  
Apolo. fol. 314. a

Loe M. Dozman, your maister speaketh of leaue, not of cōmaundemēt: and he also qualifieth that terme of leaue, as being too much; thus: *vntill they had, as it were, geuen him leaue.* It were good therefore that you learned to vse your maisters termes, rather than your owne insolent phrase, that the Emperour desired first, that by the commaundemet of the Bishops, it might be graunted him to sit downe. wheras it to be graunted him by the cōsent, permissiō, leaue, or licence, of the Bishops, is both moze agreeable to the right phrase of speache, and the verie truth it self: for as it appeareth no to heare in Theodozitus, or any other good wriiter, that any commaundemet was geuen to the Emperour by the Bishoppes, so is it euident by Theodozitus, Eusebius, Socrates, & Sozomenus, y sondry cōmaundementes were geuen by the Emperour to the Bishops, and by them most humble obeded.

Theodoritus.  
lib. l. cap. 7.  
ἐπιτροπῆ καὶ  
τῶ το τῶς ἐ-  
πιτροπῶς αὐ-  
τῶς.

And truthe it is in dāde, y the Emperour coming in, all the Bishoppes stode by reuerentlie, and he passing through y middle of thē by to his throne or chaire stāding

at the

at the bypermost parte of all, in the middelt, being now at his chayze, and readie to sit downe, seinge so many reuerend fathers standing, the most gentle Emperour maketh curtesie to sitte, whiles they stode: and after some stay, made by him, and requestes by the Bishops, that it woulde please him to sitte, he at the last satte downe, they yet standinge, with reuerence, and not sitteinge downe vntill they were commaunded (as saithe Sozomenus) to sitte. And seinge that all the hystoztes do testifie, that the Emperour sate firste, and the Bishoppes after: and that by the Emperours commaundement, saith Sozomenus: if *M. Dozman*, or *M. Harding* will gather any superiozitie, of the ordze of sittinge, it must nedes be the Emperours, who sate firste: not the Bishops, who sate after. Wherefoze *M. Dozman* most impudently asketh, why the head of that party had no place, but by licence: and why he and not they asked leaue to sitte? Where it is most euident by the hystoztes, that all the Bishops came thither, and entered into the place of the Council by the Emperour his commaundement, and sate not before they were by him commaunded to sitte. And if these men will gather of the godly Emperour his curtesie in sittinge, any other thing, than his humilitie of minde, they shall surely gather otherwise, than did those godly Bishops them selves, present with the Emperour at that holy Councell, gather thereof. Eusebius (whome you likewise alleage *M. Dozman*) saith thus. *Talis erat Constantinus comuniter quidem erga quosuis, singulariter vero curam suam ecclesie Dei impendebat.* &c. that is to say: Such was Constantinus the Emperour commonly towarde all men, but he did singularly set his care vpon the Church of God, & because

Sozom. li. i. c. 19.

Synodus federe iussa est.

Euseb. lib. 3. de vita Constant.

fa. 189.

Theodor. lib. 7. cap. 7.

Tum vna cum illo totus ille diuina ceteris confedit.

Sozom. li. i. c. 19.

Synodus federe iussa est.

Euseb. de vita

Constant. lib. 1.

fa. 169. 2.

Quasi cōmunis  
quidā episcopus  
à Deo cōstitutus,  
ministrorū Dei  
Synodos cōuo-  
cauit.  
N:que dedigna-  
e<sup>o</sup> est adesse.&c.  
Dispensare.

Dispensare.

Non dedignat<sup>o</sup>  
&c. quasi vnus  
ex multis.&c.

many were in diuers places at dissention, he, as a cer-  
taine common Bishoppe by God appointed, called to-  
gether Synodes or Councils of the ministers of God.  
Neither did he disdain to be present, and to sit in the  
middell of them, and to be made a felow of the Bishops.  
and to dispense vnto them al such thinge as made to the  
peace of God &c. Thus farre Eusebius. And by and  
by againe in the same place he saith, Medius inter eos,  
quasi vnus ex multis sedebat. that is: he sate in the  
midle of them, as one of the numbze. All these are Euse-  
bius his wordes trulie trāslate. Where you may note,  
that Eusebius saith, the Emperour had a singular care  
of the Church of God: and he saith not that the Bishop  
of Rome, but the Emperour, as he were a common Bi-  
shop, by God appointed, did assemble Synodes & Coun-  
cels of Bishoppes to the pacifying of controuerſies: and  
that he sittinge in the midle did dispense to all the Bi-  
shops such thinges, as appertained to the peace of God,  
Which by a similitude of the mistres, dispensing & deui-  
dinge to her handmaidens, their fare or worke, &c.  
Dozman would haue drawn to an argument of supe-  
rioritie, had it bene spoken of the Bishop of Rome, as it  
is spoken of the Emperour. But to omitte these things  
appertaining to the Emperours authoritie, note here  
good Reader that Eusebius, saith, that the Emperour  
disdained not to be present with the Bishops, & to sit in  
the middell of them, as to be made a felow of y<sup>e</sup> Bishops,  
as though he were one of the numbze. Which phzases  
of speech are comonly bled, whan the superiour disdain-  
eth not the company of his inferiours: & do shew that  
in dēde he was aboute them, to whome by humilitte he  
made him selfe equal and felowlke: as I do report me,

to all the learned. The same Eusebius reporteth of the Emperour Constantine, that being at a longe sermon, De vita Cōstā. lib. 4. fa. 208. c. he stode longe amongst a multitude of other hearers being rounde about him: and beinge by the Bishop who preached twise or thise earnestly and humbly prayed, that he would sitte downe, and rest him in the Royall chaire, whiche was there set for him, he would not, but refused it, and continued standinge to the ende. These are Eusebius wordes. And would any man but M. Dozma, gather hereof, that the Emperour may not sit, whan a Bishop preacheth, but muste stande before the Bishop as his superiour: where as now euerie meane man that hath a stowe, sitteth, though an Archbishoppe preach:

Rufinus in his historie Ecclesiastical testifieth, that Lib. 1. cap. 7. fa. 237. b. Helene the Emperesse, this Emperours mother, bidding holy virgins to dinner with her, did her selfe in the habite of a waitinge maide, or seruaunt, set meate and drinke on the boorde before them, and serued them with water to their handes. Will M. Dozman hereof gather that the Emperesse was inferiour to them? Sure he may as reasonable, as he, of the lowe chayze, and the courtelie whiche Constantine the Emperour vsed in his sittinge downe, doth gather, not the humilitie of the Emperours minde, but the diminution of his authority. Nowe though I truste I haue satisfied all reasonable men concerninge this chayze: yet for that I thinke, I do by M. Dozmans owne wordes, perceiue some possibilitie to satisfie him also, I will say some what more of this chayze.

M. Dozmans wordes are these: *It can be to no mā doubtfull, but that if Constantinus had bene the heade and chiefe of the Councell.*

A REPROVEE OF M.

Councell, there should haue bene prepared for him, if not such a seate as might by the Maiestie about the rest well haue declared the same, yea at the least such an one as should not by the basenes thereof compared with the other, well and plainly haue proued the contrarie. These are your wordes M. Doorman: and will it satisfie you than, if I doe show that Constantines chayze had a Maiestie in it about the rest, or at the least had no such basenes, as you speake of in it? Will it please you than to heare, and consider Sozomenus hereof befoze noted.

Sozom. li. i. c. 19  
Ad caput couē-  
tus in throno  
quodā, qui ipsi  
paratus erat, cō-  
sedit Impera-  
tor, &c.

Hic vero thronus  
maxim⁹ erat, &  
reliquis sedes  
excellebat.

Erāt multa po-  
sita subsellia.  
Synodus sedere  
iussa est.

The Emperour (saith Sozomenus) sate downe in a cer- teine throne prepared for him, at the head of all the Councell: whiche throne was the greatest, and excelled the other seates, and he calleth the Bishoppes seates in comparison to it, subsellia, vnder seates: and he saith the Emperour sate firste downe in the saide great highe throne, and than commaunded the Synode to sitte. Now M. Doorman here is some Maiestie about the rest. Looke you vpon the olde recorder you talke of, and you shall finde it so. What, doe I denie than that he sate in a lower chaire also? No that doe I not, for the other Historiographers doe say so. But dare you denie this, that Sozomenus saith of this throne of Maiestie: I belene your face wold serue you to doe it, but I thinke they all said true. And whereas first the Emperour had a throne mete for his maiestie, so great, and high about the rest prouided for him, in the whiche also he sate downe, as saith Sozomenus: yet for that, in suche a great companie of 318. Bishoppes, some sittinge further of could not heare the Emperour, whā he spake: neither he againe heare some of the Bishops sittinge further of, whan they did speake, and that great throne could not well be remoued, an other lesse chayze was brought, whiche might be set in place

place moſte conuenient to heare : whiche may appeare probable by theſe wordes of Sozomenus : Et vnum quęq; ſicut audire poterat, alloquebatur. that is, he ſpake to euery man, as he might heare. If this declaration like you not, deniſe you ſuch as both may like you, and ſaue the authoritie of the auncient Hiſtozies, and ould recordes, whiche your ſelfe ſo much bzaggeth of, crying: *if it be not ſo in the ould recordes, let me neuer be farther beleaued* : whiche I alſo in this caſe may moſte ſafely ſay. Further M. Dozman, that litle chayze you ſpeake of, was not ſo baſe as you would make it: but as Eusebius himſelfe (whom in this caſe you alleage for the lownes of the chaire) witneſſeth, it was of gould, whiche is not ſo baſe a metall M. Dozman, but I thinke you had rather haue had it, though laſſe, than one of the Biſhops bigger chaires of wood, for well you wot man pardie, (thus your Maſter, and you uſe to ſpeake) a legge of a larken is worth the whole bodie of a kiete.

Ex materia au-  
rea.

And now ſir, ſome Maſterie appearinge in y<sup>e</sup> Emperour his throne, as you required, wherein he alſo did firſt ſit downe, and after commaunded all the Biſhoppes to ſitte (as Sozomenus ſaith) & alſo no moze baſeneſſe appearinge in that leſſer chaire, than is in gould emongſt other metalles: & the Emperour ſittinge downe therein alſo firſt, and the Biſhoppes after: your Maſter and you had no great cauſe to make ſo highe a matter of this lowe chaire, and about curteſie in ſittinge downe, as you haue done: much leſſe cauſe had you, to charge vs ſo greaouſly with either *maniſeſt malice, as mangling the holy hiſtozies, or intollerable fooliſhnes, or groſſe ignorance*: onely for that the Apologie, in ſo great, and profeſſed, bzaultie, & ſhortenes, made no mention of your ſtoles,

and curtesies. Your selfe in the meane time, omittinge and dissemblinge, the attendaunce of. 318. Bishoppes vpon one man the Emperour, by his commaundement, at his owne Palace, in place and time by him appointed, and there with silence waitinge vpon his cominge, with reuerence risinge vp at his cominge, and standinge, vntill he were sette, and then by him commaunded to sitte. And you, like a man starke blinde, neither perceiuinge the height of the great throne, nor the glittering of the gould of the other chaire, could onely espie the lownes of it, whiche you terme also the basenes of it: and not seinge the reuerent risinge vp, and humble standinge of so many, graue, learned, & ancient Fathers, could marke one mans curtesie onely: and deeply dissemblinge so many notable thinges, manifestly declaringe the Emperours superiortie ouer the saide Bishoppes, do so largely prosequute suche small trifles about stoles, and curtesies: and all this you may do, without the blame of either manifest malice, in makinge writinge by the holy histories, either of intollerable foolishnes, or grosse ignoraunce (wherewith you charge vs) but you do in all pointes, euen as D. Dorman should do, and no other wise.

Dorman fol. 42.

D. Hard. Cōfut. *Yea but he warned the Bishoppes, how they should procede in  
Apol. fol. 313. b. the Councell, that is, by the doctrine of the Prophetes and Apostles.  
If they woulde here haue dealt truly, and vprightly with vs, and  
not rather haue folowed their father in lienge and patchinge: they  
woulde not haue reherjed Gloria patri without Sicur erat, nor  
taken a peece that seemeth to make for them, leauinge out that  
which maketh against them. But because they are sworne to be true*

so their occupation and so may not: Who I thancke God therefore am none of the company, will take the paines to stoope, and doo it for them. It foloweth in Theodoretus after he had mentioned the oration which Constantine had in the Councell: Hæc & his similia, tanquam filius amator pacis, sacerdotibus veluti patribus offererebat. These woordes and such like, as a sonne that loued peace, he offered vp to the Priestes as to his fathers.

Lo good readers, was not here crow you a great president for our Emperours and Kinges to meddle with the ordre of Religion?

Nowell.

Pea here is such a præident, as will for all æternitie keape wicked popishe Priestes in subiection to god by Princes: though D. Dozman, as he befoze would haue disgraced the notable woordes and factes of the Emperour Constantinus, euidently declaring his superiortie ouer the Bishoppes, by trifling about a low chaire, and a litle cartesie, so would he now deface the Emperours authoritie, declared in the admonition of the saide Bishoppes, to proceade accordinge to the Scriptures, and in the Bishops obedience to the same, by these woordes of Theodoretus, that the Emperour as a sonne that loued peace, spake to the Bishoppes as to his fathers. And here againe beside many other reproches he chargeth vs with lying and patching, for y the Apologie affirmeth that the said Emperour admonished the Bishoppes how thei should proceade in the disputations of matters of Religion: and y thei should therein folow the doctrine of the holy ghost, for y the bookes of y Gospell, of the Apostles, & the Prophetes do sufficiently declare Gods will vnto vs, saith the Emperour Constantine. Thus much of Cōstantines

hystorie alleageth the Apologie: of all the whiche, *M.* Dozman can not proue one worde vnttrue, and yet he chargeth vs theretofore with lyinge.

Touching patchinge and reherſing of Gloria patri without Sicut erat, we could not haue escaped y<sup>e</sup> Winchester taunt (so well it liked him) vnlesse the Apologie (whiche is not a quarter so bigge as are those hystories of Constantine) had rehearsed the whole booke, for if any worde at all had bene leste out, *M.* Dozman could not haue bene excluded from his objectinge vnto vs, of patchinge, and leauinge out of Sicut erat. The Emperours wordes as Theodozitus reporteth the, are these. *Laudatus rex mentionem habuit de concordia &c.* The Kinge worthe of all praise, spake of comorde, and agreement, and said, that nothinge was moze vnmete, than for the Bishoppes to impeache and accuse one another, and to geue their enemies an occasion of pastime, and laughter at them: specially in disputations of diuine matters, in the whiche they had the doctrine of the moste holy ghoſte prescribed or set befoze their eyes. For the booke of the Gospell, and of the Apostles, and the oracles or Prophecies of the old Prophetes, do plainely instruct vs, what we should thinke of Goddes will, or of diuine thinges. Wherfore lainge aside all enemylike disorde, let vs take the explicatiōs of questiōs out of the sainges of the diuine spirite. These & such like thinges spake the Emperour, as a Sonne louinge the fatherly name, to the Bishops as to fathers, desirous to cōfesse the vnitie of the Apostolike doctrine: wherunto y<sup>e</sup> greatest part of the cōpany agreed, &c. these are Theodozitus his wordes trulie translated. Wherby the discrete Reader may see, that the Apologie hath said

Lib. 1. cap. 7.

Impetere se  
mutuo.

In disputationi-  
bus rerum diui-  
narum.

Plane instruant  
nos.

ὁ κερὶ περὶ τῶν  
θεῶν φρονεῖν.

Amans patris  
nominis.

Φιλότητος.

no vntruth, neither could in that breuitie reherse the whole circumstance: and that *H. Dozman* had no cause to moue this ridiculous question. *Lo good Readers,* was not here trowe you, a great president for our Emperours and Kings, to medle with the orare of Religion? *Yea H. Dozman,* this most notable admonition giuen to the Bishops by the Emperour Constantine, and by them obeyed, is an aternall president to all godlie Princes, likewise to call all popishe Priestes, pratinge of their owne inuentions, to the triall of controuersies & questions in Religion, by the doctrine of the holy scriptures, whiche do plainelis declare God his will vnto vs: as doth that godly Emperour there affirme, and all those godlie Bishops to the same consent, and agree. So that it is by that most holie and great councill for euer concluded, and determined, that questions and disputatiōs of Religion must so be guided, controuersies in causes Ecclesiasticall, must so be determined, euen by the doctrine of the holie Scriptures: and that the holie Scriptures do plainely instruct vs, what is to be thought of Gods will, and diuine thinges or matters of Religion. *D. Harding,* by interpretinge of the Greeke woordes *περι τῶ θεῶν*, of the godhead, would beare the simple Readers, in hand, that the Emperour ment that questions about the godhead onely should be tried by the Scriptures. Whereas he might as well haue translated it, of matters of Religion, or diuine matters: and the scholes call all manner disputations of Religion, disputations of diuinitie, and the comen phrase of speache hath receiued the same. And the plaine woordes before, *In disputationibus rerum diuinarum habent sanctiss. Spiritus doctrinam præscriptam.* that is. *In disputatiōibus*

Confut. Apolo  
fol. 314. a.

περι θεῶν  
πραγματῶν

and, *περί τῶν  
θεῶν, in this  
place of Theo-  
dorus signifi-  
eth all one.*

tions of diuine matters, they haue the doctrine of the holle ghost set befoze them. And likewise the plaine wordes folowing. Sumamus ex dictis diuini spiritus explicationes quaestionum, that is. Let vs take the explanations of the questions out of the saynges of the holle ghost. These wordes going befoze, and after, doe declare that Constantine ment that al quaestions, disputations, and controuersies in Religion, shuld be by the Scriptures explicated & defined: and that D. Hardings restraine to matters of the godhead is trisuiolous, and to no purpose. And D. Dozman reading these the Emperours admonitions to the Bishops, to solowe in their disputations of diuinitie matters, & holie Scripture prescribed vnto them and set befoze them: and that explanations of diuinitie quaestions, must be had out of the Scriptures, and that the bookes of the holie Scriptures doe plainly instruct vs: and finding that all the godlie Bishops, of that great & holle coucel, assented therunto, and obeyed the Emperours either aduertisement, or commaundemēt, sealing him selfe soze greaued therewith, as with a very cut throte to al poperie, depending onelie vpon mens false traditions; and not findinge what to say to it, though it were but leudlie & colorable, as he is wonte, turneth him selfe to his customed artes of railing and scoffing, charging vs *with lies*, (whom he knoweth to haue said nothing but truthe) and with *the rehercing of Gloria patri, without Sicut erat*, soz that the apologie reherfeth not, *Sicut filius, &c.* that he spake as a Sonne, to the Bishops, as to fathers: whereas the Apologie in that breuittie, was bylaen not onely to omitte suche impertinent circumstances, but also to leave out thinges verie material and effectuous soz our purpose.

Now

How this *Sicut erat*. when al is done is nothing elles, but that the Emperour spake reuerentlie to those godlie auncient Bishops, as a sonne vnto his fathers. Whiche *Sicut erat*, song out of all tune by M. Dozman, he foloweth thus with neume. Loo good Readers, was here trowe you a great president for our Emperours, and Kinges, to medle with ordre of Religion? Hea suche a president M. Dozman, in the Emperours calling thē to the Scriptures, and their obciynge of the same, as will presse your Pope, and al his popish Prelates, and Priestes, to the very ground. But soz sooth it is a great president for your purpose (as you trowe M. Dozman) that the Emperour Constantine should be inferiour to the Bishoppes, for that he as a sonne, spake vnto them, as fathers: whiche phrase proueth nothing elles but humilitie in the Emperour, and not that he was an inferiour, but a gentle reformer of the said Bishoppes. When soeuer anie of the oulde Emperours of Rome spake to the Senatours, do they not call them fathers? And what Prince will not some time call any of his subiectes being verie oulde & graue, his father? And is the ould subiect, therefore the Princes superiour: here be slender reasons. Surely Constantine partly for that there were in that counsell so many very, as wel for age, as for learning, & vertue, reuerend men, & partly of his most gentle & hūble nature, called thē fathers, & vsed thē like fathers (as reason was he should do) but that doeth no more proue him their inferiour, than that he calleth them brethren and fellow seruantes, proueth him a quall to them: these be but phrases of courteous speache: & such humble behaviours are signes declaringe the gentlenes, and humblenes, and not the degree or state of suche as doo vse them.

Let

Let Christian Princes after the example of Constantine once bring your Pope and his Priestes from their false traditions to the Scripture, by them to be tried: & compel them to cōfesse, that Gods will is in the Scriptures plainly declared, (as did the Emperour Constantine with fauour obtaine of those Bishoppes) and it shall not offende vs if the Princes so doing, speake to your Pope and Bꝛelates, and deale with them, as fathers, as did Constantine: yet shall not the Princes therefore be their inferiours, but their gentle reformers: noꝛ shall thereby declare any your superstitie, but shewe their owne curtesie and humilitie. But these Papiſtes, the childꝛe of that generation (to vse P. Dozmanns terme) that loue to sit vppermoste at feastes, & to haue the chiefe seates in the Synagoges, and loue to be called and counted Rabbi (of whome our Saviour Christ geueth vs warning to beware) being dꝛonken w<sup>th</sup> pride & ambition, can not see in these factes of that most great, but w<sup>th</sup>hall most humble Prince, the Emperour Constantinus, a manifest imitation of our Saviour Christe, who when he was master, and the greatest of all others, behaued him selfe as his disciples seruaunt, and washed their feete, and commaunded his disciples to doo the like. Whiche his commaundement obeted, & example solowed by the vertuous Emperour Constantine, these Papiſtes, who can skill of nothing but pride and pꝛesumption, dꝛawe to a pꝛouise of minozitie and inferiortie. And I do graunt that Constantine the Emperour with his low chaire, asking leaue to sit downe, and talking as a sonne to the Bishops as his fathers, was herein inferiour to the said Bishoppes, as was Christ to his Apostles: that is, in humilitie onely: who was of humilitie

Math. 23. 3. 6.

Mark. 12.

Luc. 11.

He readie to follow his counsell, who willed all Christi-  
 ans to behaue them selues towards all elders, as to  
 fathers: and whiche is moze, readie to obeye him, whose  
 commaunded all godlie to become not onely as sonnes,  
 but as litle childzen in humilitie: And that the Empe-  
 rour did this of mere humilitie, and no inferioritie, Cu-  
 sebius, who was there present, and knewe better the  
 truthe of the matter, than do our Popishe coniecturers,  
 doeth in plaine woordes testifie, as I haue befoze de-  
 clared. But D. Dozman and his maister D. Hardinge,  
 whose do make so great and highe matters of a lowe  
 chaire, a litle curtesie, and gentle speache, going about,  
 by suche curtesie of the moste gentle Prince, to proue  
 his minoritie, them selues do depelie dissemble & with  
 great silence passe ouer manie matters of most weight,  
 at large declared in all those Ecclesiasticall histories, &  
 euidentlie prouing the Emperours authoritie ouer Bi-  
 shops, and in causes Ecclesiasticall: as that he summo-  
 ned the saide Bishoppes to the counsell, and commaun-  
 ded them, and amongst them the Bishoppe of Rome, to  
 come together without delai from so farre countreys,  
 into a place, and at a time by him selfe appoinced. And  
 when the Bishops the selues assembling could do litle  
 good, he appoinced them a day of finall determination  
 of the matters: at the whiche, he though but one man,  
 went not to their customed place of assemble, but called  
 the. 318. Bishops into his Palace, soz that it pleased him  
 to be present at their treatie him selfe: and when they  
 were come to Court, he commaunded them to goe into  
 the appoinced place befoze, & to consult vntill he came,  
 and the Bishops there with silence waiting soz his co-  
 ming, with reuerence rysing at his comming, and stan-

Lib. 1. de vita  
 Constant. fa. 159.  
 & lib. 4. fa. 208.

ding, whiles he passed through the middest of them, to the hypermost end of al the coucell, he sate in the middle of them, (as doo Princes now vsuallie in the parliament house) and than commaunded the Bishops to sit: & being by one Bishop, in the name of the whole counsell moste honozable saluted, he spake to them all, and gentlie blamed them for their dissentions, and exhorted them to vnitie and agreement, and willed them to fall to the explication of their quæstions, and determination of their controuersies, by the holle Scriptures, set before their eyes: wherein, saith he, Gods will is plainelie declared, and the Bishoppes folowed and obeyed the same: and in their treaties and disputations he ordered them, praising the Bishops, that did soberlie and learnedlie dispute, rebuking, and repressing suche as misused them selues in reasoninge, and declaringe his stonemynde, godlie, and learnedlie, amongest them in the highest pointes of our faith, he brought them by litle and litle to some consent, and at the last to full agreement. And surely a mad woork had those Bishoppes, by their dissentions made, had not the gouernaunce, of that godlie and moste wise Prince, moderated them. Whoe, when he had brought them to an happie vnitie, confirmed and authorisied the thinges by them agreed vpon, and the originall and autentike copie of the decrees of the saide counsell, subscribed with all the Bishops handes, he reserued in his owne keepinge and he sent copies thereof vnto all Bishoppes that were absent, and to all notable Christian Churches, with commaundement, that they should be obeyed: which doone, as he commaunded the Bishoppes to come together to the coun-

the councell, so gaue he them leaue to departe home frō the councell. These and many mo thinges concerninge that onely councell declaringe the Emperours authoritie ouer the Bishops, & in matiers ecclesiasticall beinge at large & most plainely declared by the histories ecclesiasticall of Eusebius, Rufinus, Socrates, Theodoritus, Sozomenus, P. Dormā, with his maister D. Harding omittinge, & most deepe dissemblinge, & cōtrarie to the plaine histories falsely surmisinge, that the Bishop of Rome had commaunded the Emperour, as the head commaunde the hand, in the somoning of the saide Nicene councell: these men, I say, thus dealing, would yet seeme so cleare from all mangling of the holie histories, from all patchinge, lyinge, and leauing out of Sicut erat, that they may freely charge others therewith: and doe thinke that they deale like true men, sworne to their Popishe occupation, so longe as they doe sing their Gloria patri, of low scooles, curtesies, and getle wordes vsed by the Emperour (whiche proud Papistes, that can no skill of curtesie, take for an argument of subiection) nothinge passinge though Sicut erat, the very truth as it was in deede by them left out, without either singinge, sayng, or any mention at all thereof, by them to be made.

And to the ende that the great dissimulation, and hyding of the truthe, whiche these Papistes doe vse, and their vnjust charginge of vs, with that, whereto they selues are moste guiltye, may the moze playnelle appeare; and withall, that the good Reader that like, may haue further intelligence, of godlie Princes authoritie ouer persons and in matiers Ecclesiasticall, in the p̄matie Churche, of infinite other notable things in the histories Ecclesiasticall at large declared, and

proving the Emperour Constantinus his chiefe authoritie over persons & matters Ecclesiastical, I have noted some, & them, with these circumstances of the Nicene cōcil, haue I deuided into certen commune places, noting the author, booke, chapter, or side of the leafe, in case the booke be not deuided into chapters, both for the commoditie of the Reader, that list in the originals see & truthe moze larglie set forth, and to the manifeste reprooue of *H. Dozma* his shameles vnruthe, satyng, *that no Emperour is to be founde, whose doings and whole life make more for the Papistes, and againstvs.*

1. The Emperour Constantinus<sup>a</sup> as a certen cōmune

<sup>a</sup> Lib. 1. de vita Constant. fa. 169. Quasi cōmunis quidā ep̄s a Deo constitutus.

Lib. 1. de vita Constant. fa. 169.

<sup>b</sup> Euseb. lib. 10. cap. 5.

<sup>c</sup> Theodorit. li. 1. cap. 30.

<sup>d</sup> Socrates lib. 1. cap. 32. 34.

Sozom. lib. 2. cap. 25. 28.

Bishop, by God thereto appointed (as saith Eusebius) as he assembled this great and holie Nicene council, so did he assemble diuers other Synodes and councils. As at <sup>b</sup> Arelatum or Arle in Fraunce, at <sup>c</sup> Caesaria in Palestine, at Hierusalem, at <sup>e</sup> Tyzus, from whence he removed the Synode to <sup>d</sup> Aelia, and <sup>d</sup> from whence at the suite of Athanasius, he commaunded the whole councell to appeare befoze him, as befoze their iudge, to render an accompt of their doinges. And of very many places, where it is intreated of his authoritie in summonings of councelles, I haue thought good to note these.

Euseb. lib. 1. de vita Constant. fa. 169. lib. 3. fa. 188. & 189. 191. 192. Lib. 4. fa. 210. 211. Lib. Histor. Euseb. lib. 10. cap. 5.

Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 8.

Theodorit. lib. 1. cap. 7. 9. 30.

Sozom. lib. 1. cap. 17. lib. 2. cap. 25. 28.

2. The Emperour Constantine vsed him selfe in the councell as the Bishops supertour.

Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 1. fa. 169, lib. 3. fa. 130. & 132.

Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 8.

Theodorit. lib. 1. cap. 7. 9. & 12. 13. 28.

Sozomenus. lib. 2. cap. 19. & 20, lib. 2. cap. 27. 28. 31.

3. **He confirmed the decrees of the Council.**

Euseb. de vita Constantini. lib. 3. fa. 191. 200. lib. 4. fa. 208.

Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 8. & 12.

Sozom. lib. 1. cap. 20.

4. **He had the keeping of the decrees of the Synode.**

Sozom. lib. 2. cap. 21.

5. **He gaue the Synode or Council leave to depart.**

Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 3. fa. 192.

Theodorit. lib. 1. cap. 13.

6. **He did write to Bishoppes and Churches for the keeping of vnitie in true Religion, and redressing of things, with commaundement.**

Euseb. de vit. Constant. lib. 3. fa. 191. 192. 199. 200.

Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 9.

Theodorit. lib. 1. cap. 10. 13.

Sozomenus lib. 1. cap. 21. lib. 2. cap. 4.

7. **The Emperour Constantine was of singular learning, and vertue, and in high fauour with God.**

Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 4. fa. 206. 208.

Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 9.

Theodorit. lib. 1. cap. 10. & 12.

8. **In so much that God did oft reueale vnto him by visions, the conspiracies of his enemies, and knowlege of many things to come.**

Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 1. fa. 159.

Sozom. lib. 1. cap. 8.

**His care about true Religion, and diligence in setting it forth was so great, that he was accounted as a certaine commune Bishoppe, by God appointed: as the most shyllie and cleare proclamour, and letter forth of Gods will, and as a Saviour and Physician of soules.**

**And he is preferred in these things, before y<sup>e</sup> Bishops.**

Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 1. fa. 169. lib. 2. fa. 183. lib. 3. fa. 178. 199.

lib. 4. fa. 207.

Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 9.

Theodorit. lib. 1. cap. 24.

Euseb. li. 1. de vita Constant. fa. 169.

Quasi communis quidam episcopus a Deo constitutus &c.

Vocalis. Dei praeo.

Quasi seruator ac medicus animarum.

10. His settinge forth of true Religion by proclamations, lawes, and otherwise, besides the places aboue noted, is declared in these places.

Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 2. fa. 179. 181. lib. 3. fa. 191. lib. 4. fa. 204. 207. 208. 211. 212.

Theodorit. lib. 1. cap. 10. 14.

Sozom. lib. 1. cap. 8. 16.

11. He appointed by his law the soday, and daies of Martyrs to be kept. Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 4. fa. 206.

207. And his authoritie in the pollicie, and outwarde gouernement of the Church, was such that he said as the Bishoppes, in preachinge and ministeringe of the Sacramentes, were the Bishoppes of the inwarde Ecclesiasticall thinges, so was he by God appointed, the Bishoppe of the outward Ecclesiasticall thinges.

12. He giueth a forme of prayer to the souldiars.

Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 4. fa. 206.

13. He instructeth great multitudes, by goodly exhortations.

Euseb. lib. 4. de vita Constant. fa. 208.

14. He repressed Idolatrie, false Religion, and heresies, by lawes, and otherwise.

Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 2. fa. 181. & 183. 201. lib. 4. fa. 207.

Sozom. lib. 1. cap. 8. lib. 2. cap. 4. 31.

15. He dealt in cōtrouersies in Religion, betwēne Bishops & other Ecclesiasticall persons, as their superiour.

Euseb. Histor. lib. 10. cap. 5.

Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 2. fa. 184. & 185. lib. 3. fa. 199.

Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 7. & 8. 31. 34.

Theodorit. lib. 1. cap. 14. 19. cap. 25. 27.

Sozomenus lib. 1. cap. 22. 23. 25. 27. 28. 30. 31.

16. He rebuked, and repproued Bishoppes and other of the Cleargie that did amisse.

Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 1. fa. 169. & lib. 2. fa. 184. & 185.

Socrat.

Soerat. lib. 1. cap. 7. 34.

Theodorit. lib. 1. cap. 13. 19. 23.

Sozom. lib. 1. cap. 16. lib. 2. cap. 4. 23.

17. He disputeth in matters of Religion.

Theodorit. lib. 1. cap. 10. & 12.

18. He intermedleth with authoritie in the election of  
Bishoppes.

Eusebius de vita Constant, lib. 3. fa. 199. 200.

Sozom. lib. 1. cap. 19.

19. He remoueth, or deposeth Bishoppes, and other Ec-  
clesiasticall ministers.

Theodorit. lib. 1. cap. 19. 20. 23.

Sozomenus lib. 1. cap. 20. 21. lib. 2. cap. 22. 28. 31.

20. He restozeth, or confirmeth in their place, Bishops  
or other Ecclesiasticall ministers.

Theodorit. lib. 1. cap. 14. 25. 31. & lib. 2. cap. 1.

Sozom. lib. 2. cap. 22. 27. lib. 3. cap. 1. & 2.

21. Finally, what authoritie and iurisdiction so euer Bi-  
shoppes had ouer their Cleargie in outwarde govern-  
ment, they had it by Constantinus the Emperour his  
grant and decree as testifieth Nicephorus lib. 7. cap. 46.  
towards the ende of the chapter: so that what authoritie  
so euer Bishops haue herein, they doe holde it of Chris-  
tian Princes: who beinge godly, and wise, will suffer  
them to holde it, as longe as they doe well vse it: so,  
bypon that condition, godly Princes gaue firste it.

These of an infinitenūbre of notable things declared at  
large in the Ecclesiasticall histories I thought god to note  
the good Reader, that would see the original, might haue  
some direction for the auoidinge of the tediousnes of  
longe seekinge. And I trust the good Reader, the either well  
considereth the circumstances of the Nicene councill,  
declaringe Constantine the Emperour his authoritie

ouer

ouer the Bishoppes there assembled, and in treatises of Religion there had, partly by me befoze notified, or will peruse the places of the histories Ecclesiasticall, by me here noted, more largely declaring the same, with more matier to the like effect, may well perceiue how vniustly M. Dozman chargeth vs, alleaginge the example of Constantine for our purpose with great impudencie, by these very wordes. *The impudencie of these men is suche, that they are not ashamed to abuse Constantinus the Emperour his name amongst other, for the maintenaunce of their opinion, and that they labour to make him a pillar to susteine and hold vp, their rotten buildinge: And againe he saith: Vhat meaneth than this leinge generation, to bringe for example, to susteine and vphould their wicked doctrine, this vertuous Emperour Constantinus? than whome if they would haue laide at their heades together for that purpose, they should neuer haue founde one, whose doings and whole life had made more for vs, or most against them. These be his wordes: But I trust I haue without either impudencie or lying, showed many, most plaine, both doinges and saynges of Constantinus the Emperour, most evidently against them, and for vs: that is, for the authoritie of Christian Princes aboue Priests, and in matiers Ecclesiasticall. Whereas M. Dozman in all those manifold, and large histories Ecclesiasticall of Eusebins, Rufinus, Socrates, Theodoritus, and Sozomenus, treatinge of Constantinus wordes, deedes, and life, hath not, nor can not alleage any one act, sentence or worde, sounding to the praise of his propositio, That the head of Christes Church herein earth must needes be a priest. Which miserable proposition, set out for a showe in great letters in the firste fronte of his booke, M. Dozman hath leste post alone, cleane destitute, forsaken, and succourles. Wherefoze*

his

Dorm. fol. 41. a.

Fol. 42. 2.

his great bragges made vpon Constantine the Emperours heade, are but the crakes of cowardes, and like to the busie barking of cowardly curre, who show thair most fearnes, whan they be sowest afrated. For in all the said historiez Ecclesiasticall he can finde nothinge, but one low chayze, a litle curtisie, and gentle speache of a most humble Prince, that may seme to sounde to the sauinge of his Pope and popish p̄lacie, from subiectiō vnto Christian Princes, whereunto, all ȳ wozdes and aces as well of the godly Bischoppes assembled at the Nicene Councell, as of the Emperour Constantine him selfe, with the whole practise of Christes Church duringe his whole life, do, by very many examplis, and æternall p̄sidentes, insoluble for euer binde them. And moze obedience than those godly Bischoppes exhibited to Constantine the Emperour, we require not in our Bischoppes: noz moze authozitie than Constantinus bled ouer those Bischoppes, and in those causes Ecclesiasticall, we do not attribute to our Christian Princes ouer persons, and in causes Ecclesiasticall: and therfoze we do not swarue from the example and practise of the primitive Church in Constantines time.

And thus you may see good Readers the very cause why M. Dozman did chose to answere the Apologie, which he knew in so great breuitie to be infozced to omitte infinite maters of weight, makinge for our purpose most effectuouly: besides the which vantage he did see an occasion, by ȳ same breuitie should be offered him, to vse his naturall occupation of quarelling & railing, whiche he is not onely sworne to, but bozne to also. As he here practiseth against the Apologie, for that it writtinge scarce halfe a scoze lines of the Emperour Co-

A REPROVVE OF M.

stantine serued not his phantasie in mentioninge of  
 stoles and curtisies, whiche trifles his maister and he  
 so largely prosequutinge, and so deepely dissemblinge,  
 and lillie with silence passing ouer so many and weigh-  
 tie maters, beinge against them, thereby to suppressse  
 the truth: I doubt nothinge, but those manifeoulde re-  
 proches of bare honestie, impudencie, intollerable foolishnes,  
 grosse ignorance, manifest malice, manglinge of the holy histo-  
 ries, rehersinge of Gloria patri without Sicut erat, patchinge  
 and lienge: Wherewith, and with many other like, M.  
 Dozman hath vnjustly here charged vs, do returne  
 home againe from whence they came to M. Dozman as  
 their right owner and true possessour.

Dorman fol. 43.

Well he was as the histories beare witness, the first christian Em-  
 perour that openly professed the faith and name of Christ (for of  
 Phillip the histories make no great accompt) and before that time  
 the Church was gouerned, either by infideles and tirantes, as Nero,  
 Domitianus, and such other: or by priestes, or by none. And this was  
 the very cause that they woulde so fatne haue wonne to their parte,  
 the first Christian Emperour.

The chu  
 gouerne  
 before  
 stantinu  
 time, eit  
 by priest  
 or by in  
 delles or  
 none.

Nowell.

Whether Constantinus were the firste Christian  
 Emperour or no, is not much materfall. Diuers histo-  
 ries do show that there were Kinges & Princes Chri-  
 stened befoze Constantinus. Pea there is an Epistle of  
 Eleutherius Bishop of Rome to Lucius Kinge of this  
 Ilande, long befoze Constantinus his time, yet extant,  
 wherein he expressely calleth the saide Kinge Vicariū  
 Christi,

Epistola Eleu-  
 therij Papæ ad  
 Lucium,

Christi, Ch: istes Uicar, and that in Church maters: soz he exhorteth him to rule his kingdome accordinge to Gods worde. And so in this Realme there was a p:ince both Ch:ristened, and gouernour of the Church before Constantine. And before Constantine his time little gouerninge, besides the office of the Bishoppes and Deacons, was requisite in Ch:ristes Church being euer vnder the Crosse and persecution: what so did néede besides the Seniours or Elders, whiche after your popishe superstition, soz lacke of thausinge and greasinge, were lay men, did well accomplishe. Your reason is leude and to no purpose, *that the Church was before Constantinus his time gouerned without Emperours.* What than: The Church of God was before Ch:ristes time gouerned without the Apostles tw: will you therefore reiect them, when God sendeth them: by that reason your Pope and popishe B:aelates and B:ielkes are surdest of from the gouernment of the Church, soz bothe before Constantinus time, and longe sithen his time, it was gouerned without suche vsurpinge Popes, proude B:aelates, and superstitious popishe B:ielkes, as now be. Neither are your B:ielkes, Præsbyteri, Seniours, or Elders, such as gouerned in the primatiue Church: and suche Seniours or Elders, as than gouerned the Church, you do nowe abhorre as mere lay men.

I conclude therefore, that before Constantine his time, and longe after his time also, the Church was gouerned, nether by vsurers Popes, nether by præsumptuous not B:aelates, but Princes rather, nether by superstitious thauelinges, such as now swarme, but were than in the primitiue Church vtterly vknownen.

The Church before Costanti-  
n<sup>o</sup> time, and long  
after, gouerned  
nether pope, pop-  
ishe prelate, nor  
prieste, suche as  
nowe would gou-  
erne all.

A REPROVVE OF M

Dorman. Folio. 43.

The next example that they bringe, is of Theodosius the Empe-  
rour, that he not onely sat emongest the Bis hoppers, but was also the  
very chiefe of the conference, betwene the Catholykes and the Arri-

D. Hard. confut.

Apolog. fo. 28. a.

& 314. & 315. a.

hath the same.

both translated

out of Hol. li. 2.

fol. 113. a. vwoord

for vwoorde.

\* In exordio ca-

pitis illius, ex

quo nonnulla

profert &c. ad

verbum.

ans. That Theodosius did in this matter nothinge of him selfe,  
but all by the counsell of Nectarius the B. of Constantinople, had  
not our aduersaries, as they did before in the example of Constan-  
tine, mangled the historie, any man might easely haue perceined. For  
reade the \* beginning of the chapiter, where this matter is mencio-  
ned, and you shall finde, that Theodosius called to him Nectarius  
then B. of Constantinople, as ked of him his aduice, what order were  
best to be taken, for the appeasinge of that Schisme whiche then so  
miserably troubled the Church: and finally embrased him selfe, and  
commaunded all other to receiue the same doctrine, not whiche him  
selfe had determind to be true, but which Nectarius and the other  
catholike Bis hoppers had deliuered and commendid to him.

Histor. ec-  
cle. trip. lib  
9. cap. 18.

No Well.

**Q.** Dorman here (as vsuallie alwaies) contrarie to  
his promesse, suppresseth and conceleth our euidence of  
Theodosius his doinges, as shal hereafter plainly ap-  
peare: & being as euell troubled with this histozie of the  
Emperour Theodosius, as he was befoze with y other  
of Cōstantine, answereth a like to both: y is, directly to  
neither of both: but bziely and lightly touchinge that,  
which so nare the quicke toucheth the papistes: & pas-  
sing ouer the chiefe matters for y authoritie of Princes  
ouer Priestes, and in matters of Religion, with silence,  
he seeketh other shifts and confectures, to elude them  
alltogether. He saith, that the Emperour did nothinge  
of him selfe but vsed the Counsell of Nectarius the Bi-  
shop of Cōstantinople, in all that he did in this matter.  
which

whiche answer his maister and he bozowed of **Hossius**, Ho. li. 2. fo. 113. a  
 as thei are wont. But whether **Theodosius** vsed autho- D. Hard. Cōfur.  
 ritie ouer persons, & in matters Ecclesiasticall as chiefe Apolo. fol. 314. b  
 governour, and that without the counsell of **Pectarius** & 315. a  
 or no, let the hystories Ecclesiasticall be iudges. First of Socrat. lib. 5.  
 all both **Socrates** and **Sozomenus** in their Ecclesiasti- cap. 7. & 8.  
 call hystories doe testifie, that **Theodosius** the Empe- Sozom. lib. 7.  
 rour dealed in matters of Religion, and betweene the cap. 5. & 7.  
**Catholiques**, and the **Arians**, and that he commaun- Imperator curā  
 ded **Demophilus** the chiefe of the **Arrians**, either to a- impēdebat, at vt  
 gree with the **Nicene** faith, or to depart frō the church: facta pace cōcor  
 and that the Emperour called together to a Synode at diam instituere;  
**Constantinople**. 150. **Bishops**, both that the **Nicene** &c.  
 faith might be confirmed, and also a **Bishop** of **Constā** Significant igit-  
**tinople** might be ordeined, (for that sea was than va- tur Demophilo  
 cant) before **Pectarius**, here by **D. Dorman** mentioned, qui Arianz relia  
 was **Bishop**, or knowen to the Emperour. For he was gioni præerat  
 chosen **Bishop**, by those **Bishoppes**, who were by the &c.  
 Emperour assembled. And for that the said electō was Socrat. li. 5. ca. 8.  
 notable, & effectually declareth the authoritie of **Pri** Imperator nihil  
**nces** ouer **Bishops** therein, I will rehearse **Sozomenus** cunctatus syno-  
 the authours owne woordes, touching y same at large, dum episcoporu  
 whiche are these. **Imperator** præcepit vt diligenti in- suæ fidei pperē  
 quisiuione quam max. fieri posset. &c. that is to saie: conuocauit.  
 the Emperour commaunded that as honest and good a Sozo. lib. 7. ca. 7.  
 man, as possible might be fonde, should be sought out,  
 to whome the highe Priesthood of that citie might be  
 committed. But the **Bishoppes** were not of the same  
 mynde: for euery of them desired to haue some one of  
 their friendes to be ordeined **Bishop** there. These be  
**Sozomenus** woordes truely translate. And thortlie af-  
 ter it soloweth in **Sozomenus**, **Cum sacerdotibus Im** Sozom. li. 7. ca. 9  
**perator**

perator mādasset vt in charta quadam nomina eorū,  
 quos singuli dignos qui ordinarentur iudicarent, cō-  
 scripta darentur, ac sibi ipsi potestatem vnum ex om-  
 nibus eligendi reseruasset. &c. that is to saye. When  
 the Emperour had commaunded the Bishops that the  
 names of the, whome euery Bishop iudged woorthy to  
 be ordeined, should be wryten in a paper, and deliuered  
 to him, and had reserued to him selfe power or authori-  
 tie to chose one of al those ( whose names wryten shuld  
 so be deliuered vnto him) the Bishop of Antioche, whā  
 he had first wryten those, whome he thought good, last  
 of all (to gratifie Diadozus Bishoppe of Tharsis) he  
 wrote Petrus. Than the Emperour reading ouer  
 the names of them that were wryten, staled at Petrus  
 name: and falling into a studie, layng his finger  
 vpon the last name, toke earnest deliberation with him  
 selfe. Than readinge ouer againe all the names from  
 the beginning of the bill, at the last he chose Petrus.  
 All the Bishoppes wondered, and asked who was that  
 Petrus, what was his exercise, and whence he was:  
 And whan it was knowen that he was not yet Chri-  
 stened, they did yet moze wondze at the Emperour iud-  
 gement. And shortly after saith Sozomenus: Ista autē  
 haud sine diuina dispositione acciderunt. These  
 thinges did not happen without Gods disposition. For  
 the Emperour, whē he heard that he was not yet Chri-  
 stened, continued firme and steadfast in his determina-  
 tion, though manie Bishoppes were, and spake against  
 it. And when all the Bishoppes gaue place, and agreed  
 to the Emperours determination, Petrus was  
 Chri-stened, and hauing yet the mysticall vesture vpon  
 him, was by the commune consent of the Synode or  
 counsell,

Quod ne myste-  
 riorum quidem  
 adhuc factus es-  
 set particeps.

Nondum ini-  
 giatus.

Mysticam veste-  
 mētibus.

counsell, ordeined Bishop of Constantinople. Manie also did beleave that these thinges were thus done by Gods oracle or revelation, made to the Emperour. <sup>Dei oraculo,</sup> But I will not discusse whether this be so, or not. But yet I beleave that this came not to passe without <sup>Non extra Dei</sup> Goddes appointment: for when I consider the unlooked for <sup>aurum,</sup> ordination, and the thinges that afterwardes folowed, I thinke that this man, as most meeke, good and honest was by God appointed to that bishoprike. Thus farre are Sozomenus his owne woordes trulie translated. Which I have nowe at large repeted: for that M. Doz- man would beare me in had that the Emperour Theodosius in matters Ecclesiasticall, did nothinge of him selfe but all by the counsell of Pectarius.

1. But here may you see mosse eidentlie, that befoze Pectarius was Bishop, or Chyrtened, or it knowen, what manner of man he was, the Emperour toke care of Religion, and peace makinge in controuersies betweene the Catholikes and Arians.

2. And that he called. 150. Bishops together to a counsell at Constantinople, to the extirpinge of the Arian heresse, and the confirming of the Nicene faith.

3. And that the Emperours iudgement, in commaunding the best and meetest man to be chosen Bishoppe of Constantinople, was farre better and rather to be folowed, than the mindes of the partiall Bishoppes, who would euerie of the haue some one of their own friends chosen Bishop, and so should neuer haue agreed vpon one, had not the godlie Emperour moderated their partiall studies.

4. That the Emperour commaunded the Bishoppes to write euerie man those, whome he did thinke mosse meete

A REPROVVE OF M

incede for that rowme, and to bying them vnto him.

5. That y<sup>e</sup> Emperour reserued vnto him selfe autoritie, to choise out of al y<sup>e</sup> numbze by them to be named, one, to be ordeined Bishop of Constantinople: which in that diuersitie of the Bishops iudgements, or rather partfall studies, was most necessarie.

6. And you see howe he did choose Nectarius, though he were last of al w<sup>r</sup>iten, cōtrarie to the mindes of the Bishops, who, if they would haue had him chosen, would rather haue w<sup>r</sup>iten his name first.

7. You see that whan it was knowen, that Nectarius (though els a good man was not yet Ch<sup>r</sup>istened, that the Emperour did persist and continue in his purpose of hauing him Bishop, though many of the Bishoppes were soze against it.

8. You see that at the last, all the. 150. Bishops submitte them selues to the Emperour, and allowe his election, and ordeine Nectarius by the Emperour elected, Bishop of Constantinople.

9. You see the iudgemēt of the authour of y<sup>e</sup> Ecclesiasticall histo<sup>r</sup>ie Sozomenus, and of mane other godlie mē in those daies, that this election of the Emperour, cōtrarie to the Bishoppes mindes, was not onely good, godlie, and profitable to the Church, but also thought to be done by speciall reuelation shewed from God to the Emperour.

10. Finallie you see, that in this assemble, and this election, Theodosius did take vpon him emongst the Bishops as their superiour, & chiefe gouernour: and that neither in these matters Ecclesiasticall, noz in those cōtrouersies of Religion, betweene the Catholikes & Arians, he did any thing by the councill of Nectarius, for  
he dealt

he dealt therein befoze *Nectarius* was either *Bishop*, or *Christened*, or knowen to the *Emperour*, or to the *Bishoppes* there assembled: and therfoze *M. Dormans* glofe touching *Nectarius* y<sup>e</sup> *Bishops* aduise, cā nothing hinder the chiefe authoritie of *Theodosius* the *Emperour* ouer the *Bishops*, and in matters *Ecclesiasticall*, declared by actes done befoze *Nectarius* was in place, or knowen to the *Emperour*. And soz that *M. Dormans* did see that the *Apologie* in y<sup>e</sup> *hzeritie* could not declare these & many other like examples of *Theodosius*, and other *Christian Princes*, he had the better mind to deale with the *Apologie*.

Nowe where he saith, that the beginning of the .18. chapter of the .ix. booke of the *hystorie tripartite* testifieth that the *Emperour* called to him *Nectarius*, y<sup>e</sup>sed his aduise, and finally embraced him selfe and commaunded all other to receiue the same doctrine, not whiche him selfe had determined to be true, but whiche *Nectarius* and other *Catholike Bishoppes* had deliuered and commended to him. These are *M. Dormans* wordes. But the *hystorie* of *Socrates*, in the fiste booke and .x. chapter out of the whiche that .xviij. chapter of the .ix. booke of the *tripartite* is take, in the very beginning of y<sup>e</sup> chapter, testifieth, that the *Emperour* did intende a redresse in *Religion*, and assembled the coūcel &c. befoze it maketh mention of *Nectarius*: so that the origine and beginning of this redresse came of the *Emperour* him self, and not of *Nectarius*.

The wordes of *Socrates* in his *Ecclesiasticall hystorie* are these. Turbabantur autem & alie ciuitates, Soer. lib. 5. ca. 10  
*Arianis* ex oratorijs profligatis. &c. that is to saue,  
 Other cities also were troubled, the *Arians* being driven out of their oratories or *Churches*: in the whiche  
 Mmm thing

The Emperours  
councell.

Thing one may much meruaile at the Emperours coun-  
sel. For he would not suffer as much, as did in him lie,  
that cities should be filled with tumultes: but after a  
short time, he caused a Synode or counsell, of all heres-  
ies or sectes to be assembled, supposinge that it would  
come to passe, that if the Bishops might conferre toge-  
ther presentlie, they should fall to con corde and vnitie.

The Emperours  
purpose in cal-  
ling the counsell  
prosperous.

This purpose of y<sup>e</sup> Emperours, I thinke was the cause  
that the matter went prosperously for ward with him.  
Hitherto are Socrates his owne woordes trulie tran-  
slate: and hitherto you see the Emperours counsell, and  
purpose praised by the author as godlie, & prosperous, &  
a counsell of all sortes of Bishops by his owne autho-  
ritie assembled, without any aduise take of Pectarius,  
or any other Bishop in the historie mentioned: and that  
therefore, where D. Dozman saith, that the Emperour  
did all by the counsell of Pectarius, and that he did in  
this matter nothinge of him selfe, and referreth vs to  
the beginning of the chapter, he saith all this of him  
selfe, and without the booke, as they say, the cleane con-  
trarie appearing in the beginning of that chapter: and  
that the Emperours counsell, and doinges, without  
any counsell of Pectarius, were good and prosperous.  
In deede it foloweth after ward in y<sup>e</sup> chapter after this  
sort. Accersit igitur ad se Imperator Nestariū. to say:  
the Emperour therfore sent for Pectarius the bishop, &  
consulteth with him, how it may come to passe y<sup>e</sup> Chri-  
stian mē shuld not thus dissent amongst the selues, but  
that the Church might be toynded in vnitie. And y<sup>e</sup> Em-  
perour said to him. y<sup>e</sup> it shuld be necessary, y<sup>e</sup> the questiō,  
for the which the churches were at variance, should be  
discussed: & that all disoord taken away, peace might be  
restored

The Emperours  
aduise in proce-  
ding.

restored to the churches. Pectarius when he heard this was in great perplexitie & doubt: & he called vnto him Agellus the Bishop of the Nouatiās, as agreeing with him in y<sup>e</sup> faith, & certifieth him of y<sup>e</sup> Emperours mynd. But Agellus though otherwise religious, yet was he not able to dispute of controuersies in Religio. Wherefore he appointed a certen Reader (whom he had vnder him) named Sisinus, who should take vpon him to dispute. And shortly after it foloweth: this Sisinus considering that schismes were not only not quieted by disputations, but also that heresies were by them made more contentious, gaue to Pectarius this counsell: that all subtil disputations should be auoided, & that they shuld vse the expositions of the old fathers for their testimonies, & that the Emperour shuld demaund of the captiues, or chiefe heretikes, in what estimation they had those Doctors, who were before this diuision, whether they iudged the to pertain to y<sup>e</sup> church, or did repel the, as no Christians: & shortly after, Hic à Sisinio auditis, Nectari<sup>o</sup> festinantèr ad aulā pperat &c. that is to saye. Whā Pectarius had heard this counsell of Sisinus, he made speede to the Court, & declared to the Emperour what counsell was geuen him. The Emperour gladly folowed this counsell, & handled the matter prudētly. Thus farre word by word, euen as Socrates writeth of all y<sup>e</sup> circumstances of this matter, onlie some places impertinent (for auoiding of too muche prolixitie) here & there intermitted. And thus the Emperour vūnge this counsell, set the heretikes at variance amongst them selues, as in the historie foloweth. Whereby you may see good Readers, that both Pectarius Patriarke of Constantinople, and Agellus the Bishop, being both at

Nectari<sup>o</sup> with-  
out counsell.

The Nouatians  
were a sect of  
Heretikes.

A Bis hop not so  
learned as his  
Lecturer.

Their wilkes ende, **Silinius**, an inferiour meane minister in respect, guideth them by his counsell: and that therefore wisdome in governing of Churches, and ordering of matters ecclesiasticall, is not teid to dignities, myters, and sees, as these men would have it: & that Princes by the wise and godlie advise of inferiour ministers may take order, not only with severall Bishops, but with Synodes or counsels. You see also, where **M. Dozman** would have the Emperour **Theodosius** inferiour to Bishop **Pectarius** in Ecclesiasticall matters, only for y<sup>e</sup> he used **Pectarius** counsel (for so he falsly surmiseth) y<sup>e</sup> by the same reason, & moze trulie too, it should folowe that the Patriarke **Pectarius** was inferiour to **Agellus** Bishop of the **Pouatians**: and that both Bishop **Agellus** and the Patriarke **Pectarius**, should be inferiours to poze **Silinius**, the leaturar of the **Pouatian** Church, for that they used his counsell in daede: & so did the Emperour too. But **M. Dozman** talkinge of mangling, is not ashamed both to mangle, and falsifie the hystorie, and to saye it was **Pectarius** his counsell, where his master **D. Hardinge** could not dissemble a matter so eident, but confesseth that it was **Silinius** his advise, and counsel, though they both dissemble that this **Silinius** was a **Pouatian** heretike. Now in case **M. Dozman** wil reason thus: though **Silinius** was the first author of y<sup>e</sup> counsell, yet for that **Pectarius** heard it of him, and brought it to the Emperour, it was now become **Pectarius** owne counsell: I will than praise **M. Dozman** to deale evenlie with vs, & for so muche as the Emperour heard it of **Pectarius**, and brought it to the Synode of all the Bishops, let it by the like reason be not **Pectarius**, but the Emperour his owne counsell.

For

Confut. Apolo.  
fo. 28. a. & 314. b

For it is as good reason y<sup>e</sup> Pectarius should geue place to the Emperour, seinge he was but a messenger, as that Sisinus should in that coucell, whereof him selfe was the authour, geue place to Pectarius, being but a learner. And lest some Papist should surmise that Sisinus was some one of Bishoppe Pectarius his inferior cleargie, ouer whome he had some authozitie, and might lausfully vse his learninge and aduise as his owne, (for whiche cause neither D. Hardinge, nor D. Dozman will be acknowen who this Sisinus was) it is euident by the histozie, that Sisinus was a Prouationian, of contrarie Religion to Pectarius in some pointes, and accompted an heretike, and none of Pectarius Church, how muche lasse colour had D. Dozman either to make it Pectarius his counsell, and to say that the Emperour did all by the counsell of Pectarius, or therfore to make the Emperour inferior to Pectarius, for that he vsed his Counsell: seinge that reason concludeth, that both Pectarius and the Emperour were Sisinus the poore lecturers inferiours, for that they both in dæde vsed his counsell. Now were it so as D. Dozman surmiseth, that it was the counsell of Bishoppe Pectarius (as in dæde it was not) and that the Emperour vsed his counsell: is the Emperour therfore inferior to Pectarius the Bishoppe, because he vsed his counsell? I meruaile, why the histozie doth not than say, y<sup>e</sup> Pectarius the Bishop called the Emperour as his inferior, but that y<sup>e</sup> Emperour called him the Bishop: The Emperour vsed the counsell of other wise men his subiectes also in other maters (as do al the Princes the aduise of their Coucellours) yet were they not therfore his superiours. And who is moze mete to

be of the Princes counsell in matters of Religion; than a godly learned Bishop: which we neuer denied, nether doeth it mislike vs. Nay it pleaseth vs right well, that M. Dozman graunteth that the Prince with the aduise of one godly learned Bishop, may take order in whole assemblies and counsellies Ecclesiasticall, as here did the Emperour Theodosius by M. Dozmanns confession: specially seing the said Withoppe was not the Withoppe of Rome, to whome they geue all power absolutely: But M. Dozman would hereof insinnate to the simple Reader, that all the aduises of Bishoppes in matters Ecclesiasticall, what so euer they be, are to be solowed of Princes, and that Princes, without the aduise of Bishoppes, may in Ecclesiasticall matters do nothinge at all. But, as it soloweth not, that a Prince muste of necessity solow the aduise of euery ciuill counsellor in matters ciuill, vnlesse the counsell be good: no moze soloweth it, that a Prince should of necessity solow the aduise of euery Bishoppe in matters Ecclesiasticall, for that he is a Bishoppe, but for that the counsell is good and godly: and least of all soloweth it, that the Prince for any such counsell geuen or taken, should be therefore inferiour to the one, or to the other. This is proued true by the example of Theodosius the Emperour here, who cleane contrarie to the minde of these Bishoppes, did proceade in the election of Nectarius. And whan Nectarius was chosen & placed, y the Emperour solowed not any his counsell, in respect of his persone, in that he was Archebishoppe, or Patriarke, but for that the counsell was good, and profitable, falleth out evidently hereby, that the saide counsell was not Nectarius the Archbishoppe of Constantinople his counsell,

cell, nor any other Bishops, but the aduise of a meane Ecclesiasticall minister, yea and of one of the Nouatian heresie, and yet not therefore reiected, but solowed as god counsell, notwithstandinge the counseller his meane estate, beinge in dede no Bishoppe, but an inferiour poore officer, in an inferiour poore Church. And therefore it is plaine, that not the dignitie of the person, or name of a Bishoppe, but the godnes of the counsell was by the Emperour here respected: and that after this example, Christian Princes may deale not onely with seuerall Bishoppes, but with whole assemblies and Synodes of Bishoppes, by the aduise of the learned of the Cleargie, though they be of meaner degree, and in dede no Bishoppes.

Now soloweth in the hystorie that, which is mooste peculiar to our cause, after this sort. Imperator autem ubi confusam illorum dispersionem cognouit: that is: when the Emperour perceiued their confused diuision, and that they had their confidence in disputation onely, and not in the expositions of the old fathers, he went to an other counsell, and commaunded that euery Religion should declare the summe of their faith in writing, which euery of them did. And whan a day was appointed them, the Bishoppes of euery Religion, beinge called to the Courte, came thither together: Petarius and Agelinus Bishoppes of the Homousiane faith, were present: And Demophilus Bishoppe of the Arian secte: and Cunctus him selfe, Bishoppe of the Eynonian secte: and Cleusius Bishoppe of the Macedonian secte. When these came together the Emperour receiued them: and takinge the writings of euery secte, goinge a side he prayed to God

That is, that Christe in his deitie is of the same substance with God the father.

most

most earnestly, that he would heape him in that cho-  
 singe out of the truth. When readinge the severall wri-  
 tinge of every secte, he rejoyced and tare in peces all  
 the other writings, as bringinge in a seperation of  
 the holy Trinitie: and that onely writinge, whiche  
 contained the Homousiane faith he praised, and imbra-  
 sed or receued. Hereof was occasion geuen, that the  
 Ponnans did prosper againe, and had licence to keape  
 their assembles within the Citie. And the Emperour  
 meruailinge at their agræing in faith, with his, decreed  
 by a lawe, that they might resorte to their oratories or  
 Churches without feare, and enioie the priuileges,  
 that others of the same faith did enioie. Thus sarre  
 Socrates, worde by worde, as nere I could possible  
 translate it.

Amplēctur.

Here I beseeche the good Reader, consider, that when  
 the counsel, brought from Silinius the lecturer by Pe-  
 ctarius to the Emperour, and by him vsed, did heape  
 nothinge to con corde, but set them at moze variance:  
 the godly and wise Prince toke an other way (whiche  
 neither Pectarius, Agellus, nor Silinius, for ought  
 that appeareth in the historie, did before thinke vpon)  
 and he commaunded the Bishoppes to write the summe  
 of their faith, he called them to his palace, at a day ap-  
 pointed, he receiued their writings of them, he went a-  
 side, & praised earnestly for Goddes ayde in the cho-  
 singe out of the truth, & folowing the same, he did condemne &  
 teare all the heretikes writings, and allow the onely  
 writinge, that contained the truth: and he decreed by a  
 law, that the Ponnans (though other wise taken for  
 heretikes) onely for that they agreed in the truth of  
 Christs diuinitie, & one substance with God the father,  
 should

Should haue their Churches, assemblies, and priuileges. And withall note the sinceritie of M. Dozman, who is not ashamed to say that the Emperour did nothinge of him selfe in this matter, but all by the counsell of Pectarius Bishoppe of Constantinople. Whereby he doth not onely mangle, and falsifie the historie, but also maketh that godly Emperour, and the good Bishop Pectarius, both most notable hypocrites: as though so godly an Emperour as was Theodosius, (beinge the iudge) & so godly a Bishop as was Pectarius (beinge a partie) had colluded together: & as though, all the Emperours painefull doinges, and seruent praers to God, to healpe him in choosinge the truth, had bene nothinge elles but hypocrisie: and as though he beinge determined to doe onely, as Pectarius one of the parties in that case, had put in his head, and deliuered to him (as saith M. Dozman) shoulde come colorablie forth, as assted by God through praier, to discern and iudge the best. And this deuise liketh not onely M. Dozman, but also his maister D. Hardinge, and Hosius authour to them both. For in the popish Synagoge, and specially in the Court of Rome such packinge is called the determination of the holy Ghost. But the historie it selfe sheweth, that as the Emperour did call all those Bishoppes to the counsell, and chose Pectarius Bishoppe without the other Bishoppes aduise, yea against their aduise: so did he now without Pectarius aduise, by Goddes healpe by praier obtained, chose the soundest doctrine: and did all other thinges of him selfe, and of his owne authoritie, by the wisdom and grace, whiche was geuen him from God. Yet doe I thinke verely that some Papistes will say that this historie of Theodosius by

D. Hard. C6fut.  
Apolo. fol. 315. 2.  
Ho. li. 2. fo. 113. 2.

me so largely alleaged both in one point make very much against vs : for that (will they say) we do not esteeme the expositions of the ould fathers , as did those heretikes at that time . But they shall therein do as they are wonte to do , that is maliciously belie vs . For we do not reiect the expositions of those ould fathers, whiche are in this histoꝛie spoken of , who were afore that time , that is . xi. hundzeth yeares agoe and moze, which ancient Fathers expositions make on our side, against the nue false gloses of the Papistes: but we do reiect those false gloses of nue popish steppes fathers, vnbozne longe after these fathers, here spoken of, were dead: for that the saide gloses are cleane contrarie to the terte of Goddes woꝛde. And we haue holsome counsell, and good warrant in Goddes woꝛde it selfe , so to do. For thus emongst other saith the prophet Ezechell.

Ezechiel. 20.

Abominaciones patrum eorum ostende eis. &c. & mox . In præceptis patrum vestrorum nolite incedere, nec iudicia eorum custodiatis, nec in Idolis eorum polluamini . Ego Dominus Deus vester, in præceptis meis ambulate, & iudicia mea custodite, & facite ea. that is to say . Showe them the abominations of their fathers . &c. and shortly after . Do not walke in the præceptes of your Fathers, nether keape ye their iudgementes, nether be ye defiled with their Idolles . I am the Lorde your God, walke in my præceptes, and keape my iudgementes and do them .

Maiorum , qui recte præcesserunt, vestigijs insistere pulcherrimè. Cic.

Thus Goddes woꝛde warneth vs . Yea Pagans and Heathen men did well see , that the steppes of those fathers onely were to be folowed , who did goe rightly befoze vs .

Donnan

Dorman fol. 43.

And truly maruell had it byn if he had other wise daen in matters of Religio any thing, to the prejudice of that auctoritie, which Bishoppes and Priestes of right ought to haue in those matters: who at other times had so often declared his minde persuaded to the contrary, and namely in that councell that he caused to be assembled at Aquileia: where in the sommons of that Synode he openlie protested, that controuersies arising vpon matters of doctrine, can not be better tried, then by beinge referred to the Bishops, that they quoth he, from whome the very groundes and principles of doctrine haue proceeded, may if there fall out any doubtles, dissolue the same. For the whiche woordes, beinge a fier warder rehered in the councell, it appeareth how greatly S. Ambrose praised him, when he said openlie. Beholde what ordre the Christian Emperour hath taken, he will not doo any iniurie to the Priestes, he referreth to the Bishoppes the interpretation of all doubtles.

D. Hard, Cōsue.  
Apol. fol. 315. b.  
hath the same.  
both borowed  
out of Hosius  
lib. 2. fol. 112. b.  
vwoorde for  
vwoorde.

Norwell.

¶ Doorman leaninge those so many, & most plaine matters in the histozies Ecclesiasticall, evidently declaringe the authoritie of the Emperour Theodosius ouer Priestes, and in matters of Religion, to y<sup>e</sup> which he can say nothing directly, now seeketh vncertaine cōteatures, thereby to make some shewe of somewhat, whereas in dede he can say nothinge at all, to any purpose. The place which he alleageth out of the councell, houlden at Aquileia, out of the rescript of the Emperour Gratianus, Valentineanus, and Theodosius is an obscure, darke, and vncertaine place, and w<sup>r</sup>iten in such Latine, as is not likely to be vsuall in those learned dates. And for that, that no plaine sence coulde be gathered thereof, Peter Crabbe the collectour, or some man

els for him, hath by a marginall note holpen the blinde ferte, with the addinge of one worde to the terte, and changeinge of an other in the text; both which marginall emendations, Hosius, (of whome M. Dozman, and his Maister bozowed this place) by his Cardinalles authoritie hath taken in, and incorporate into the terte it selfe, and goeth smoth away with the matier, as though it had bene saide by the text, that the iudgement of controuersies were the Bishoppes, whiche is not there to be founde.

Judicium.  
& discordis, pro  
discordia, in  
textu.  
Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. 12. b.

In the margent  
is added.  
Judicium.

Now whereas the wordes of the terte are these: *Neq; controuersia dubia sententia rectius poterant experiri q̄ si aborte altercationis in interpretes ipsos constituissimus Antistites*, which sentence, though obscure, can haue none other sense, but ȳ the Emperours (whose wordes those should be) haue appointed the Bishopps to be interpreters of the controuersies: & the Emperours to be the chiefe governours, who had the authoritie so to appointe. M. Dozman to his commoditie hath translated those wordes thus, *That controuersies arisinge vpon matiers of doctrine, can not be better tried, than by beinge referred to the Bishoppes*. This is M. Dozmaus interpretation, & qualesying of the matier, by change of persons & numbres, ȳ by such absolute referring of matier to Bishopps, he might suppress the authoritie of Princes included in ȳ worde *constituissimus*, we haue assigned or appointed. Likewise he translateth, *à quibus proficiscuntur instituta doctrinae*. From whom the very groudes and principles of doctrine haue proceeded. that is to say, from the Bishopps, but in deede ȳ very groudes & principles of doctrine haue not proceeded from the Bishoppes, but from God, and his holy worde: he might therefore more truly

Experiri.  
Quam si constituissimus in interpretes ipsos Antistites.

trulle haue saide: from whome instructions of doctrine; or in doctrine haue proceeded. For Bishops laid not the groundes and principles, but haue builded their doctrine thereupon, and thereby haue taught vs.

Where he saith it appeareth how greatlie S. Ambrose praised him (Theodosius) for those wordes. It may in daide appeare to all the learned, that M. Dozman neuer read that councill, nor S. Ambroses wordes there. For they shall well perceiue, that the Emperour, whose is spoken of in this councill seuerallie, was not Theodosius, but Gratianus: for both in the treatie of the councill, and in the epistle of the council to the Emperours, not Theodosius, but Gratianus is specially named, by these wordes. Cōpletum in te est, clemētissime prin-

ceps, Gratiane, q̄ scriptura diuina laudauit. Et rursum. Imperator noster Gratianus iussit orientales venire, ipse Imperator nobis dixit. Et rursum: non credimus religiosum Imperatorem aliud dixisse, quam scripsit. That is to say, That is fulfilled in the Gratian, most mercifull Prince, whiche the diuine scripture doeth praise. And againe, Gratian our Emperour, commaunded the Bishoppes of the East Church to be present, the Emperour saide it to vs. And again. We do not beleaue that the godlie Prince spake otherwise than he did write. These wordes goinge befoze, and after the place by M. Dozman here alleaged, being undoubtedly spoken of Gratian, do declare that the Emperour, whose wordes S. Ambrose doeth praise, was Gratian, whose in that councill had the moste to do, and not Theodosius, as M. Dozman surmiseth.

And thus it may appeare howe these Papistes, do not looke vpon the originall, but borow one of an others

Cōcil. Aquilei;  
1. Tom. Confil.  
fa. 395. col. 2.  
& deinceps.

notes, that whiche they thinke will serue their turne.

Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. 12. 13.

And no meruaile that M. Dozman hath called here in, for his authour Hosius was also herein deceiued. Whom (not S. Ambrose, nor the counsell of Aquileia) M. Dozman hath solowed woord for woorde, in all this treatie of Theodosius, as in all places els.

And where the woordes of S. Ambrose are these. Imperator ipsos interpretes constituit Episcopos, that is: the Emperour hath constitute or appointed the Bishoppes to be interpreters. M. Dozman translateth them thus. *The Emperour referreth to the Bishoppes the interpretation of all doubtes*, of his liberalitie puttinge in, all doubtes, and of his wisdom, as afoze, so here againe, dissemblinge the Emperours authoritie, whiche the woorde constituit, he did constitute or appointe, doeth import. This place therefore beinge of it selfe obscure, and the marginall notes, beinge by Hosius taken into the text, and the whole beinge falsified by M. Dozmanns dissembling translation, or liberall addition: and Hosius, (for what should I speake of M. Dozman) so scelerlie looking vpon the matier, that he tooke Theodosius, for Gratianus, this place I saye, therefore can haue in it no matier of weight.

Howbeit we will neuer denie, but that Emperours or other Christian Princes, may constitute or appointe suche Bishoppes, as they knowe to be learned, and of sound faith, to be interpreters of doubtes: for this is all, that can be gathered of this place. But as the Emperour, did appointe Bishoppe Valeriane, S. Ambrose, Eusebius, with other learned and Catholike Bishoppes present at that counsell, to be interpreters, so would they not appointe Valadius, or Secundianus,

Manius, or any other Bishop beinge an heretike, to be  
 any of the saide Interpreters. No more will any godly  
 Christian Prince constitute or appointe any Popish  
 Prelates, the corrupters of Religion, to be interpre-  
 ters in controuersies of Religion. But in the Empe-  
 rours appointinge of the Bishoppes to be interpre-  
 ters, I can not see but that the Superioritie remaineth  
 in the appointer, and the inferioritie in the appointed.  
 These woordes of S. Ambrose, whiche he spake in  
 that councell of Aquileia, and are there twyse or  
 thyspe repeted, are worthie the notinge. Ambrosius Concil. Aquilei.  
 dixit: Superioribus temporibus concilium sic factū  
 est. &c. that is to saye. Ambrose (the Bishoppe) saide  
 thus: in former times, the councell was so ordred,  
 that the Bishoppes of the East Church should haue  
 their councell in the East, and the Bishoppes of the  
 West Church should haue their councell in the West:  
 we being Bishoppes of the West partes, are assembled  
 at the citie of Aquileia, accordinge to the Emperours  
 commaundement. Farther the Lord Deputie of Italie Iuxta Impera-  
toris præceptū.  
Præfæ<sup>o</sup> Italix,  
 wrote his letters, that if they of the East would  
 come together, they might: but because they knowe  
 this custome, that the councell of the East Bishoppes  
 should be kept in the East, and the councell of the  
 West Bishoppes in the West, therefore they thought  
 they need not to come. Thus farre are S. Am-  
 brose woordes spoken in this councell, by M. Doz-  
 man here out of Hosius alleaged, trulie translated:  
 the effect whereof, is againe repeted in the sayde coun-  
 cell. And thinke you good Readers, that had those  
 Bishoppes thought some one Partes to haue bene  
 head of the whole Church, or the Bishoppe of  
 Rome

Rome in those daies had bene taken for the saide head of the whole Church, as well of the East as the West, that S. Ambrose would haue made suche a diuision of the towne Churches, had he taken them both to be vnder suche an one head, the Bishop of Rome, without any mention of him, at all: And that he would haue saide expressly, that the Bishoppes of the West Church were assembled in council at Aquileia by the Emperours commaundement, and haue made mention of the Lozde President, or Deputie of Italis his letters to the East Bishoppes, without any mention made of the Bishoppe of Rome by S. Ambrose, or in all that council, by any other Bishoppe, at all, had they thought the saide Bishoppe of Rome to haue had any authoritie, as head, either in the whole Church or in the West Church, where that council was kepte: Wherefoze, as in the constituting of the Bishops to be interpreters, so in the assembling and somoning of this council at Aquileia, being in the West Church, by the Emperour, the Emperours authoritie therein is expressed plainly: and rather contempt, than any authoritie of the Bishop of Rome, is by continuall silence of him, in a council holden in the West Church, and so nere Italie, not obscurelie signified.

Lib. 5. cap. 8, 9.

And about the same time, the Bishoppes of the East Church, beinge by Damasus than Bishop of Rome, and the Synode there called, not by his, or the counrels autozitie, but by the Emperours letters, to a great Synod, than kept at Rome, they would not appeare, but refused that iourney as vnprofitable, as witnesseth Theodozitus. So that it is euident, y the West church at that time acknowledged no sute nor seruice to the Bishop of

shop of Rome. *Yes, and the said East Bishops make declaration of the election and consecration of Petasrus Archebishop of Constantinople, Flavianus Archebishop of Antiochia, and Cyrillus Archebishop of Hierusalem made, without any the consent of the Bishop of Rome.*

*Dorman. Fol. 43.*

*If Theodosius had taken vpon him to iudge in matters of faith being a lay man, could s. Ambrose thinke you that florished vnder him haue byn ignorant thereof? If he could not, would he haue praised him for that he did not? Would he haue asked of Valentinianus the younger beginning in his youthe (although he after repented) to encroche vpon the spirituall limites and iurisdiction: Quando audisti clemētissime Imperator in causa fidei Laicos de Episcopo iudicasse? When did you euer heare most gentle Emperour, that in matters of faith lay men, haue iudged of the Bishoppes doings? Might he not haue answered, (if it had bene as our aduersaries saie) I haue not hard onely but known also by experience, that mine owne felowe in the empire Theodosius, hath doen so. So that here vpon we may be bould probable to cōclude (s. Ambrose vertue, wisdom, learning, long experience and great practise in Christes Church, wel considered,) that Theodosius attempted no such matter, nor did anie thing in religion without the councill of such bishops as being catholike, instructed him what he should doe, for thaduañcement and setting forwarde of Christes catholike faith.*

*Nowell,*

*This conjecture of Hostius liketh M. Dorman so well, that where as he hath made thereof a large discourse before, he is yet nowe againe in hande with it. But I remitte the Reader to the former place where*

*D. Hard. Gen. Apolog. fo. 317. hath the same. translated out of of Hof. lib. 1. fo. 38. b. & li. 2. fol. 112. b. vwoord for woorde. Non responderet: audiui quod fecerit hoc imperij mei consors &c.*

*Ho. li. 2. fo. 112. b. Dor. sup. fo. 23.*

*Dor. sup. fo. 88.*

*Do*

*M. D. 2. &c.*

**P.** Dozman alleaged this, and to myne answer to the same, wherein I trust I have fullie satisfied this vaine coniecture. Here it shalbe enough to saye, that though Valentinian the yonger had neuer heard that anye godlie Lay men, Prince, or other, had taken vppon them to iudge of Bishoppes in a matier of faith, without any assistance or aduise of the godlie learned, as Valentinian did attempt to do, yet did both Theodosius at that time deale with Bishoppes in matters of Religion as chiefe governour therein, and Constantine, and Valentinian the elder, had likewyse deale, as I haue befoze declared. Of whose full dealing therein as chiefe, both S. Ambrose, & Valentinian y<sup>e</sup> yonger had often heard, though they had neuer heard of anye suche vntill dealing, as Valentinian y<sup>e</sup> yonger attempted to haue bene vsed by them, being righteous, good, and godlie Princes. But whereas P. Dozman leauinge Theodosius his owne actes beinge mooste manifest, whereby the plaine truthe of his doings may appeare, falleth to coniectures, vpon S. Ambrose his praying of Gratian the Emperour, & vpon his questions moued to Valentinian the Emperour: I will set Theodosius his owne doings befoze the good Readers eyes plainelike, and brieuely, and so leaue it to his iudgement, whether he dealt with Bishoppes, and in matters of Religion, as a chiefe governour therein, or no.

**I.** Theodosius by his owne authoritie, without any mention of the authoritie of the Bishoppe of Rome, or anye other Bishoppe, assembled Synodes, and Councelles, and firste.

The second generall councill at Constantinople.

Socrates. lib. 7. cap. 8.

Theo-

Theodoritus. lib. 5. cap. 7.

Sozomenus. lib. 7. cap. 7. & 9.

**He assembled likewise an other councill at Constantinople.**

Socrates. lib. 5. cap. 10.

Sozomenus. lib. 7. cap. 11.

**The councill of Aquileia in the West Church, he with the Emperours, Gratian, and Valentinian the yonger, assembled by their commaundement, without any mention of the Bishop of Rome at all, as appeareth in that whole councill it selfe.**

Concil. Aquile.  
Tom. 1. Concil.  
fa. 394. & c.

**He dealeth in the councill as superiour to the Bishoppes.**

Socrates lib. 1. cap. 10.

Sozomenus lib. 7. cap. 11.

**He confirmeth the decrees of the councill.**

Socrates lib. 5. cap. 8.

Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 9. 16.

**He reduced Valentinian the yonger to the right faith, and restored the catholike faith, and Religion de-rated, by Valentinian the yonger, and his mother.**

Rufinus lib. 2. cap. 17.

Theodoritus lib. 5. cap. 15.

Ambrosius lib. 5. Epist. 34.

**He dealeth in the election of Bishoppes, with more, both authoritie, and synceritie, than do the Bishoppes them selues: and that, as it was thought, by Gods speciall direction.**

Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 7. & 8.

Theodoritus lib. 5. cap. 23.

**He romoneth Bishoppes that were heretiques.**

Socrates lib. 5. cap. 7. & 10. 20.

Theodoritus lib. 5. cap. 16.

Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 5. 6. 11. 17.

**He alloweth goodly Bishoppes.**

Doq 2

Socrat.

Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 7. & 10. & 120.

Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 9.

8. **He iudgeth betweene the Catholike and Heretike  
Bishoppes.**

Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 10.

Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 12.

9. **He reprehendeth Bishops, euen the Bishop of Rome,  
and that sharplie, and defendeth Flavianus Bishop of  
Antiochia, against the Bishops of Rome, and endeth  
their controuersies, whiche had continued. 17. yeeres,  
and after that longe dissention, restoreth peace to the  
Churche.**

Theodoritus lib. 5. cap. 23. 24.

Of these manifest Actes of Theodosius the Empe-  
rour, plainelie declared in the historics Ecclesiastickall,  
is his authoritie ouer Bishops, and in causes Ecclesia-  
sticall to be considered, rather than by those vaine and  
vncerten coniectures, vpon S. Ambroses wordes spo-  
ken to other Emperours; whereunto from the plaine  
truthe, M. Dozman, by alleaging not S. Ambrose, but  
Hosius, would bring vs. And I doubt nothing, but the  
discreat Reader will hereby vnderstande, that M. Doz-  
man thā lafeth mangling of the historics to our charge  
most, whā he intendeth most to play & māgler him self.

Dorman. Fol. 44.

Hosius treateth  
of the Chalce-  
don. coucel. li. 2.  
fol. 114. b. & c.  
and D. Harding  
Confut. Apolo.  
fo. 315. b. & 316. a  
answereth as  
doth M. Dormā.

It foloweth in the Apologie, in the councell of Calcedon the ec-  
clicke magistrate condemned for heretikes by his sentence, Dioscorus,  
Iuuenalis, Thalassius, being all Bishops, and iudged them worthy  
to be degraded. Here would I faine knowe in what place, or where  
they finde this historie written. If they saie in the 5. booke and tenth  
chap. of Socrates historie, as the place is in the margin coated, I must  
nedes tell them that the place hauing byn there sought for, can not be  
founde. And as litle hope is there of finding the same els where, if a

man maie beleue vehement presumptions. For if in that counsell, Iuuenalis and Thalassius had bene at all condemned by any magistras either ecclesiasticall or ciuile, as well should it of all likelihood haue byn mentioned in the actes and recordes of the counsell of Calcedon, as was the condēnation of Dioscorus, they being all accused, and partakers of one crime. True it is (although in the place by them alleaged there be no such thinge) that in the actes yet of the counsell we finde a recorde, where the ciuile magistrates consented, that Dioscorus had well deserved to be of his bishopricke depriued, and of all priestly dignitie degraded. But here I beseeche you diligently to consider: if to the Bishoppes, to whome God had committed the charge to giue that sentence, it should so steme good. And these are not my wordes but his that was sente from the whole counsell to Dioscorus, (who then after the manner of all heretikes fled from the face of the counsell, and lurked I wot not where) Ioannes the Bishop of Germanicia (who after he had tolde him in what termes he stood, that was condemned by the whole counsell, he added this clause, Si hoc placuisset sanctissimis episcopis, quibus hanc inferre a domino deo creditum est, if it so seemed good to the holy Bishoppes to whome God had comitted the power to giue that sentence.

Actio. 3.

Act. 3.

Euagrius

lib. 2. ca. 4.

This sentence after wards (the said Dioscorus continuinge in his obstinacie) was by the whole counsell allowed, and by the legates of the Bishop of Rome in his name pronounced, no mans name subscribed, or consent asked thereto, besides the onely Bishoppes. And thus much for Dioscorus: for of Iuuenalis and Thalassius, till they shew where, and when they were condēned for heretikes and wronly to be degraded, I can say nothinge. Although this in the meane season I may holdely say, that if they (the ciuile magistrates I meane) gaue any such sentence, it is very likely that they would qualifie it (as you haue before) that they did in Dioscorus) with this adiection, if the Bishoppes thincke good, to whome that matter belongeth. Which

If they did, what have they then gotten by the alleaging of such a sentence I pray you?

Not well.

Whereas the printer by negligence set this marginall note (Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 10.) against the treatie of the Chalcedonense coucell, which should haue bene set three lines higher against the treatie of Theodosius the Emperour, where the Apologie hath these wordes (Theodosius Imperator vt ait Socrates) whereby the printers error could not be vnknownen to M. Dozma, who, as he professeth, seeking there, could not chuse but finde the said treatie of Theodosius the Emperour, and so might be certified, touchinge that marginall note, if he list: Yet it pleased him to make a matter heretof, declaring thereby to any discrete Reader, what aduise he would gladly make, had he iust occasion geuen him thereto. But where he affirmeth that there is as little hope to finde the matter touching Iuuenalis and Thelastius, els where, as there, that is, that it is vnpossible to be founde any where (for there in dede it is not possible to finde it) and that if any such thinge may be found of them, yet that it as well, as the other of Dioscorus, is so qualified, that we can get nothinge by the alleaging of it. His master D. Hardinge also maketh the same answer. But what credit is to be geuen herein, specially to M. Dozman either his diligence, as one that hath sought in all places, & can not find it, or to his truth, as one that will not conceile whatsoeuer he findeth, though directly for vs, & against him selfe, both hath heretofore sufficiently, and may in this place also very well appeare. For both the coucell of Chalcedon, which he pretendeth he hath searched, and Euagrius

Socra. lib. 5. cap.  
10.

Confut. Apol.  
fol. 316. a.

In the very place by *M. Dozman* here alleaged, that is, in the second booke & fourth chapter of his Ecclesiasticall historie, hath these wordes. *Gloriosissimi iudices & amplissimus senatus dixerūt: de recta quidem & catholica fide, perfectius sequente die conueniente concilio, diligentiore examinationē fieri oportere, peripicimus. Quoniam vero Flavianus. &c. y is to say: The most glorioſous Judges, & honorable Senate (meaning the iust Magistrates present at that cōcill) said thus, or decreed these thinges as *Euagrius* hath. Concerninge the right and catholike faith we do consider y more diligent inquisition and search is to be made, the next day, whan the counsell cometh together. But soz so much as *Flavianus* of godly memoire, & *Eusebius* the most reuerend Bishop, by the search of thinges done, & examinatōs, & by the very wordes of certen, who were in that Synode the chiefe, confessinge that they haue erred, & haue without cause condemned, & deposed these men, who being in no error about the faith, are declared to be vniustly deposed: It seemeth to vs, and God, to be right and reason, (if it shall so please our moste holy and gracious Lo:de the Emperour) that *Dioscorus* the most reuerend Bishop of *Alexandria*, and *Iuuenalis* the most reuerend Bishop of *Iherosalem*, and *Thalassius* y most reuerend Bishoppe of *Casaria* in *Cappadoce*, and *Eusebius* the most reuerend Bishop of *Ancyra*, & *Constantinus* the most reuerend Bishop of *Berſe*, and *Basilius* the most reuerend Bishop of *Seleucia* in *Isauria*, who had than the chiefe authoritie, and principate of the Synode. be put to the same punishment, (of damnation and deposition) & that they by the holy counsell accordinge to the Canons or rules, be depriued from their*

Bishoplie

Chalcedon. cōcilij. Act. i. fa. 831. col. 2. Euagr. li. 2. ca. 4. decreuerunt.

The Iudges and Senate were lay men and not of the Clergie.

Frustra eos damnasse. Euagrius deposuisse. Euagrius videtur nobis & Deo acceptū & iustum esse.

Potestatem & principatū tunc Synodi tenerūt Dioscorus, Iuuenalis, &c.

Bishople dignitie: so that all thinges done, be referred to the Emperour. And as Euagrius saith, all thinges were done, accordinge as it was decreed by the Emperours Maiestie so. Than the Bishops of y<sup>e</sup> East & other Bishops with the cried: this is a iust & righteous iudgement, God send longe life to the Senate, many yeres to the Emperour, Christ hath deposed Dioscorus, Christe hath deposed the homicide, or murderer. This is a iust sentence, iust is the Senate, iust is the Councell. But y<sup>e</sup> reuerende Bishoppe of Illerike said: we haue all erred, we al aske perdone. Thus saute are y<sup>e</sup> wordes, as wel of the counsell of Chalcedone, as of Euagrius in the booke & chapter by M. Dozman here noted, truely translated. And shortly after it soloweth in Euagrius. Hiscè à sancta synodo confirmatis, &c. When these thinges were confirmed by y<sup>e</sup> holy Synode, & diuers other thinges done, they whiche were deposed with Dioscorus (y<sup>e</sup> is Iuuenalis, Thalastus, Eusebius, & the other Bishops as afoze) the Synode so praying & the Palace (that is to say the Emperour) graunting, obtained reuocation. These are the very wordes of Euagrius also (in the same chaptet by M. Dozman here alleaged) truely translate. The wordes of the Bishop of Romes Legates, here for breuitie omitted, I will speake of hereafter: so to M. Dozman occasioneth me.

Ricephorus also, besides these, might haue certified M. Dozman how Iuuenalis and his felowes were pardoned. And so the good Readers may see, that there is not so litle hope of findinge these thinges, as M. Dozman would beare them in hande.

And senge this iudgement, geuen not onely vpon Dioscorus, but also vpon Iuuenalis, and Thalastus,  
with

Cū autē cuncta  
vt ab Augusto  
vertice decreta  
erant, perficeret  
sur, &c.

Euagrius lib. 2.  
cap. 4.

Obsecrate syno-  
do, annuete Pa-  
latio, reuocatio-  
nem consequuti  
sunt.

Lib. 15. cap. 4.

With other Bishoppes, who were the chiefe at the Cypheene councell, by the ciuill Magistrates, is written in the very same booke and chapter of Euagrius, whiche is in this place by M. Dozman alleaged, and in the councell of Chalcedon, whiche he pretendeth he hath narrowly searched, the good Reader may well vnderstande, that he had no cause to vse such straunge dealinge, as he by these his wordes declareth. Here woulde I faine know in what place, or where they finde this historie written. I muste needes tell them, that in the place of Socrates historie in the margent coated it is not, for it hath bene sought for, and can not be fonde, and as litle hope is there of findinge the same elles where, if a man may beleaue vehement presumptions. For if in that councell Iuuenalis, and Thalastius had bene at all condemned by any Magistrate either ecclesiasticall or ciuill, as well should it of all likelihoode haue bene mentioned in the Actes and recordes of the councell of Chalcedon, as was the condēnation of Dioscorus. These are M. Dozmans wordes. Yea he repeteth them in effect yet once againe afterward, for feare of forgettinge so notable a warninge to vs by him geuen. And haue you in dede good M. Dozman, sought in the 5 booke 110. Chapter of Socrates for y<sup>e</sup> histozie of the Chalcedonense councell, & for that you finde it not there, belcaue it can be fonde no where, nowe surely it may well be your dede, for no wise, or learned mā would haue sought for it there: it beinge well knowen, y<sup>e</sup> Socrates, though he did write seuen bookes, yet did he not in the last of thē, reache so far as to y<sup>e</sup> Chalcedonense councell, by a great deale: & yet M. Dozman sought for it longe befoze in the fiftē booke. Bylike M. Dozman is a bachelor of diuinitie onely, and not of histozigraphie too. And no meruaile y<sup>e</sup> you could not finde it in y<sup>e</sup> place coated in the margent,

Socrā. li. 5. ca. 10  
A diligent searcher and true reporter.

Fol. 44. b.

of the Apologie, seeing you could not finde it in the place by your selfe noted. For who coated your booke in the margent against your treatie of this matter thus (Euagrius lib. 2. cap. 4.) for there it is in deede, as well in the Actes and records of the councell to be found, as I haue at large shewed: and if you did reade that chapter, you muste needes see it. What sinceritie is this than to say as you doe: *that it is not mentioned in the Actes and records of the Councell, that there is as little hope of findinge this historie els where (as in Socrates) if a man may beleaue vehement presumptions. that is: that it is impossible, to finde it any where.* Why man it was vnder your nose in the Actes and records of the Councell, whiche you talke of, and befoze your eyes in Euagrius his seconde booke and. 4. chapter, by you coated. If you looked vpon either the councell or the place by you coated; (as you praetende you searched them both diligently) you were in case as was the butcher, who holding his knife in his mouth, sought for it, and after longe seekinge, could not finde it. If you looked not in your mouth, vpon the booke, I would say, I commende your diligence: you might as well haue letten your margent goe skarke naked, as so couldly to haue coated it. If you can not finde a thinge in Hostius, (who if he haue lost all that you haue founde, hath losse his whole booke) you take it for a vehement praesumption that it can be founde no where. But in deede the Papistes haue no more nether care, nor conscience, then hath a curre dogge, in either seekinge, or findinge of the truth, or in confessinge of it, if they happely finde it, but goe on by hooke or crooke, by omittinge, dissemblinge, corruptinge, depzaulinge, manglinge, beleting of the old doctors, and writers, to maintaine their pre-

sumed.

sumed vntruthes, which they are purposely determined, they care not howe, to mainteine, so they may mainteine them. Now wheare M. Dozman saith, that in case we can finde any suche recozde, that he may boldly say, that it, with the other matier of Dioscorus, is so qualified, that we shall get nothinge by the alleaginge of suche a sentence: I trust the discreat Readers consideringe the Historie, and processe by me befoze out of the councill Calcedonence, and Euagrius truly worde for worde translated, do see the qualification of the mater right well.

1. And firste, who were the moste glozious Judges, who appointed the times, and dates, whan maters of faith, and whan other matiers were to be entreated of: euen the ciuill Magistrates, who were there in the Emperours behalfe, and had the firste and chiefe place, and authozitis in the councill alwaies, whan it pleased them to be present.

2. Againe you see that the said Judges decreed these thinges for so Euagrius termeth it.

Euagrius. Is qui in senatu erant ista decreuerunt.

3. Thirdly you see, that vpon due proufes alleaged, the saide Magistrates folowinge the phrase of the Apostles determination in their councill, do say thus: It seemeth god and right to God and vs, that not onely Dioscorus, but also Iuuenalis, and Thalassius, with the other Bishoppes should be put from their liuinges, (as they had serued others) and by the holie councill be depriued of the degreé and dignitie of Bishoppes, for that they had deposed Flavian, and Eusebius as though they had bene haretikes, who in deede were in no error, and therefore they (who deposed them) shewed them selves in so doinge to be haretiques.

Videtur nobis & Deo, acceptum & iustum esse.

4. You see that all these things were referred to the Emperours iudgement, as both the councill and Euagrius doe declare, and that accordinge as he decreed, all was done: as saith Euagrius.

Cuncta vt ab  
Augusto vertice  
decreta erant,  
perficerentur.

5. You see that whole numbres of Bishoppes call this sentence of the Magistrates, a iudgement, and deposition of Dioscorus, and doe allowe this sentence of the Magistrates, as a iust sentence, and iudgement, yea, as the sentence and iudgement of God: and none gaine saith it.

6. Finally you see, that they, who were deposed, were (no doubt vpon their submission) restozed againe. But how restozed: the Synode or councill (saith Euagrius) so praying, and beseeching: and the Palace (that is to say the Senatours, or the Emperour him selfe) granting it.

Euag. li. 2. ca. 4.  
Obsecrante Synodo annuente Palatio.

These things being thus: yet, saith M. Doorman, that he may boldly speake of such qualifing of the matier, that we shall gaine nothinge for Christian Princes authoritie in councelles, by the alleaginge of such a sentence. And he would qualifie all this most notable sentence, and iudgement of ciuile Magistrates, by terminge it consentinge. But I doubt nothinge but all reasonable men may see here suche a qualifing, for Princes authoritie ouer Bishoppes, and councelles, that the substance thereof can be plucked out of their mindes, by no qualification of yours, M. Doorman. Yet you bringe in for your further qualification, these wordes of one man, the Bishoppe of Germanicia, whiche he spake in a corner to Dioscorus: Si hoc placuisset sanctissimis Episcopis &c. that is to say: If it seemed good to the holy Bishoppes, to whome it is by God committed to geue that sentence. But your qualifing here,

by taking this litle patch of the whole sentence, is very  
guiltful. The place is thus. Iohānes episcopus Germani-  
ciae dixit. Ante tres dies secundum præceptionem  
pijsimi & Christi amici nostri Imperatoris &c. that  
is to say: thre daies agoe, at the commaūdent of the  
moste goddlie, and friend of Ch:ist, our Emperour, the  
most magnificent and glozious iudges, and most holie  
Senate, with the holie and great Synode, made exami-  
nation of those faultes, whiche were by the religious  
Bishoppe Eusebius, laid to thie charge, and determi-  
ninge, published sentence against thē, if it should so  
please the moste holie Bishoppes, to whome it is from  
God committed to geue the saide sentence. And the  
holie and great Synode, considering what becommeth  
it, hath thus longe gyuen respite to thie Religious-  
nes &c. These are the woordes of Iohannes Bishoppe  
of Germanicia, beinge sent from the Councell to  
Dioscorus..

Concil. Chalced.  
Act. 3. pag. 846.  
col. 2.

Euagrius  
lib. 2. ca. 4.  
Sarth the Synod  
confirmed the  
sentence already  
giuen by the  
iudges.  
dedit inducias.

Of all this you rehearse a dosen woordes in the lat-  
ter end, leauing out both the Emperours commaūde-  
ment, and the examination of the ciuill Magistrates, &  
their decerning, and pronoucing of sentence in Diosco-  
rus his cause, as Iudges: whiche might conuict you of a  
lie, sayng they consented. And thus doing, you say these  
are the woordes of him, that was sent from the whole  
councell to Dioscorus, it is so: these are as many of his  
woordes, as like you. But the Iudges or Senatours,  
who spake not in a corner, as this mā did to Dioscorus,  
but befoze the whole councell, did with authoritie, pro-  
nounce it, as a sentence, and iudgement, & all the coun-  
troll alloweth it, as a iust sentence, and as Gods iudge-  
ment, and they do referre all the matters not to the  
councell,

Concil. Chalced.  
 1. Et. 1. fa. 245.  
 col. 2. Impera-  
 tor pmisit, &c.

councell but to the Emperour, whoe, as the whole  
 councell confesseth, permitted the councell to haue the  
 hearing of that matier. Now the determination be-  
 ing made, and sentence pronounced by the Judges, who  
 were ciuill Magistrates, if they permitted yet vnto the  
 Bishops of the councell to deale with Dioscorus, & vpon  
 his submission to procure pardon for him by their hum-  
 ble sute to the Emperour, as they did for Iuuenalis, &  
 Thalassius, or vpon his stubbornesse, to let the sen-  
 tence giue take place, as God shuld put in their misde:  
 what can that make against vs, vnlesse you would beare  
 men in hande, that we doe affirme that Bishops haue  
 nothing at all to doe in councels: But we neuer denied,  
 but that the aduise, and iudgement also of godlie Bi-  
 shops, in condemning of hæretiques, and hæresies, and  
 in other matters of Religion, is to be thought to come  
 from God, as long as their iudgemēt doth not repugne  
 to Gods. But that doth nothing exclude the authoritie  
 of Princes in the said councels. For, if one would like-  
 wise say, that such a matier shalbe enacted if it like the  
 Lordes of the Parlyamēt, and if it like not the Lordes  
 of the Parlyament, to whome God hath committed  
 the giuinge of sentence there, it shall not be enacted.  
 This were in deede a true saynge: but what maketh it  
 it against the Prince chiefe prerogatiue in the Par-  
 lyament? Trulle nothings at all. No more doeth  
 this, whiche is here spoken of the Bishoppes likynges,  
 and sentence, hinder any thinge the Princes authori-  
 tie in that councell, but that they doe appointe times  
 of treatises, doe decree and determine thinges, giue and  
 pronounce sentence against Bishoppes, yea, and the  
 greatest Bishoppes, (suche as were Dioscorus and  
 Iuena

Juuenalis) beinge offendours, and determine what is good for the Bishoppes assembled in counsell to do, whome it is meete for them to depriue, or depose, referre all to the Emperour. And that Bishoppes offenders beinge penitent, and submitinge them selues, obtaine pardon, the Synode or Councille for praynge and beseching, & the Palace (that is to saie the Prince) grauntinge it. And no doubt had Dioscorus submitted him selfe, as did Juuenalis and Thalastus, and the counsell thereupon had humble sued to the Emperour for his pardon, as they did for the others, he had also escaped that vtter condemnation and deprivation, whiche he fell into. And therefore might Iohannes Bishoppe of Germanicia, well saie, Si hoc placuisset. &c. If it soe pleased the moste holie Bishoppes vnto whome God hath committed to geue that sentence. Thereby to moue Dioscorus to submission to the counsell, and soe by the suite of the counsell, to obtaine grace at the Emperours handes.

Now concerning Paschasinus and other the Bishop of Rome his Legates doinges and saynges, vsed or vsurped in that counsell, I do not denie but that they spake many thinges soundinge for the prerogatiue of the Bishop of Rome, whose Legates they were. But partlie they did it so couertlie, partlie the Synode was so occupied about other weghtie matters, y they either obserued not their woordes, or thought it not good by quarelling about the to hinder those matters of weght whiche they had in hande. But those weghtie matters beinge once ended, they bydded the Bishop of Rome, by their decree made in the, 16. Session of this counsell,

decla-

declaring the Bishop of Constantinople to be of equal authoritie with him. Whiche decree they made managree the Popes Legates: and as it may appeare they were the rather occasioned and prouoked thereto by the malapert behauiour of the saide Legates in that counsell. But of this I will intreate at large hereafter.

Howe of what value or authoritie the saynges of the Popes owne Legates glauninge towardes their maisters superiortie (to the whiche the Popes did than though secretlie, and couertly, beginne by forgerye and all vnlauffull meanes to aspyre) can be, any reasonable man may easely iudge, euen of their wrestlinge of the Scriptures to onely Peter, whiche either appertaineth not to him at all, but to Christe onelie, or to other Apostles as well as to him. But the verie truche of the matier, not couertlie, noz silite touched, in wordes onelie, (as doeth Paschasius the Popes purposed encroaching) but in most manifeste deedes and actes of this counsell, clearly declared, moste plainelie sheweth that the Emperour, and the ciuill Magistrates in his place, were the Iudges, and had the chiefe authoritie in that counsell, as I sufficiently haue declared, and will moze particularlie hereafter note, where the learned Reader may be moze fully satisfied.

Touching the pronoücing of the sentence, & truth is, that euery Bishop did giue his iudgemēt seuerally, as well as the Popes Legates by these woordes. *Alienum eum iudico ab omni episcopali dignitate & ministerio. Alienum esse definitio. Alieno eum ab &c. Alienu esse decerno. &c.* That is to say: I doe iudge him to be put from all Bishoplike dignitie, and ministerie, sayth

Concil. Chalced.

Act. 3. fa. 847.

Euagri. li. 2. ca. 4

Paschasius dixit

Cū gloriosissimo

Apostolo Petro

qui petra & bā-

sis vel crepido ē

caatholicæ eccle-

sia, & fundamē-

tum orthodoxæ

fidei.

The coucel ter-

meth the tven-

tie times Glorio-

sissimos iudices,

the most glori-

ous iudges.

Act. 3. fa. 848.

Maxim<sup>o</sup> Antio.

Stephan<sup>o</sup> Eph.

Lucian<sup>o</sup> Byz.

saith Marimus Bishoppe of Antiochia. I desine him to be dispatched of all Priestlic dignitie, sayth Stephanus Bishop of Ephesus. I doe alienate him from his sacerdotall ministrie saith Bishop Lucianus of Byzia. I descerne him to be estraunged from all sacerdotall ministrie saith Peter Bishop of Cozinth: which sentences giuen by the whole Councell, and by their subscriptions confirmed, as plainely appeareth in y<sup>e</sup> Actes of the councell, any of the Secretaries of the councell might as wel in the name, and by the authoritie of the whole coucell, haue pronounced y<sup>e</sup> sentence, as Paschasius the Popes Legate. The sentence of the whole councell of the holye Apostles at Hierusalem was pronounced by S. James, not by S. Peter, of whom y<sup>e</sup> Pope claimeth to be head of y<sup>e</sup> whole Church. And if it, being graunted that Paschasius as president of the Councell in the place of the Bishop of Rome, who had the firste place amongst the Patriarkes, did pronounce the sentences, what maketh that so? this vsurped authoritie of the Popes, nowe claimed: who can therby claime no other preheminence, thā other presidentes of other more auncient councelles had. It is recorded in this same Chalcedonense councell, that Dioscorus Bishop of Alexandria, had the Principate in the Ephesene councell: in case the Bishop of Rome had likewise in his legates the principate in y<sup>e</sup> Calcedonense councell, what can he claime thereby, more than Dioscorus might: Or what shall let him therefore, but he may come to Dioscorus his account: For sure the Bishops of Rome now do deserue as much, and more than euer did Dioscorus. But seing D. Dorman maketh so much of pronouncing of sentences: this whole councell was knit by, and the last sentence thereof was pronounced by the iudges, who were ciuil magistrates: which sentence also quite ouerthoweth y<sup>e</sup> Bishop of Rome his su-

Rqq premacie,

Act. 3. fa. 8; 8.

Act. 1. fa. 83r.  
Principatum  
Sinodi tenuerunt  
Dioscorus, Iuuenalis.  
&c.

Act 16.

A REPROVVE OF M.

Act. 1. fa. 741.  
col. 1.

Act. 3. fo. 835.

Act. 3. fa. 848.

premaie, for it maketh the Bishop of Constantinople of equal privilege & authority with him. In dede it is true that Paschasinus & Lucentius the Popes Legates were very busie when the ciuill Magistrates and Judges were present, vntill Lucentius being well taken vpp by the sayde Judges, was put to silence. And after their departure Paschasinus began to take al vpon him againe, but Anatolius Archebysop of Constantinople, nowe and then interrupteth him: and the other Bysshops do ioyne together, and match Leo Bysshop of Rome, and Anatolius Bysshop of Constantinople: and they ioyning the two Sees of Rome, and Constantinople together, call them both Maximas sedes, & sanctiss. Ecclesias: the greatest Sees, and holpest Churches. Where M. Doz- man sayth further that no mans name was subscribed, or consent asked to the depriuation of Dioscorus, bysides the onely bishops, I pray you marke his sinceritie herein. I haue declated before howe the Senatours determined, that Dioscorus should by the Synode be deposed by these very wordes of the counsell, and of Euagrius. Videtur nobis & deo acceptum & iustum esse, vt Dioscorus religiosiss. Episcopus Alexandria, Iuuenalis & Thalassius, &c. That is to say: It seemeth good & righteous to vs and to God, that Dioscorus the most religious Bysshop of Alexandria, Iuuenalis, and Thalassius, &c. be put to the same penaltie by our moste mightye Lorde, and besides that, be by the holy Synode put from their bishoply dignitie, &c. and al things which are done, to be put to the iudgement of the Emperours highnesse. And when y Senatours had thus determined what they would haue the Bysshops of the Synode to doe, the Bysshoppes crying that this iudgement was iust and right, the Senatours departed out of the Synode: and so the Synode for that day brake vp, and the first action ended.

The

a Cöcil. Calcedon. Act. 1. fa. 331. col. 2.

Euagrius li. 2. cap. 4.

b Omnib<sup>9</sup> quæ acta sunt, ad sacrum apicem referendis.

c Euagri<sup>9</sup> li. 2. cap. 16. iustum est hoc iudiciu

d Hoc itaque conuentu sic soluto, ad aliu

in quo soli sanctiss. conuenerent episcopi, &c.

The next day that ſynode was kept, onely Biſhops, (the minde and determination of the Magiſtrates now being to them known) came together: and there finally they according to the Magiſtrates determination afore declared, and iudgement by them giuen, did depole and depriue Dioſcorus. What meaneth M. Dozman therfore to ſay, that no mans conſent was asked to that deprivation of Dioſcorus beſides the onely Biſhops, ſaying that in that ſeſſion there were none but Biſhops onely preſent: and ſaying not onely the conſent, but the iudgement alſo of the ciuil Magiſtrates was in the firſt ſeſſion before giuen, and therfore needed not to be asked: And the iudgement of the Magiſtrates was not lightly eſtimated, ſo: the innocent and goodly Biſhops cryed: *Iuſtum eſt hoc iudicium*, this iudgement is iuſt, it is Chriſtes iudgement: & the offenders cryed ſo: mercy, ſaying: *Omnes errauimus, omnes veniam petimus.* We haue al erred, we al pray ſo: pardon: which pardon ſaith Euagrius they obteyned, ſynode ſuing ſo: it, & the pallace, that is the Prince granting it. This being thus, yet is not M. Dozman aſhamed to terme it a conſent, and to write, that no mans conſent beſides the Biſhops onely was asked. Whereas it is euident, that the ciuil Magiſtrates did giue not onely their conſente, but their iudgement alſo: and that the Biſhop did all things by the appointment of the Senatours, and according to the iudgement and decrees of the Emperour. Now ſo: the fuller declaration of the Emperours, & ciuil Judges authoritie ouer the Biſhoppes, and in that councill of Chalcedon, I haue, as afore, noted out certaine by theſe pointes, touching their ſaid authoritie, with directions where they are to be founde.

Obſecran-  
ſynodo, annu-  
ente palatio  
reuocationem  
coſequuti ſunt.

Euag. lib. 2.  
cap. 4.  
Cum cuncta vt  
ab Auguſtiff.  
vertice decreta  
erant, perfec-  
rentur.

1. It is expreſly declared in the beginning of euery ſeſ-  
ſion

Secundum dei gratiam et sanctionem, præceptum præceptione iustione pijsimi domini nostri Imperatoris, sancta & magna synodus congregata.

tion & in sundry other places, y<sup>e</sup> the Calcedone councill was sommoned and assembled, by the Emperours, Valentinea, and Marcians auctoritie and commaundement, as is to be seene in the sayde councill.

Act. 1. fa. 736. fa. 740 fa. 741. col. 2. 846. col. 1. fa. 847. col. 1. fa. 860. col. 2 &c. 861. col. 2. fa. 863. col. 2. et Act. 16. fa. 935. col. 1.

And in a great number of other places.

And it is recordeed in the sayde Calcedonese Synode, that the Bishop of Rome was by the Emperours sommoned to Coñcels, in the same tenure that the Bishop of Alexandria, and other Bishops were sommoned.

Act. 1. fa. 748. col. 1.

The Emperour was the chiefe in the councill, and all things were referred to him.

Act. 1. fa. 831.

Impator nosfer pijsimus permitit sancto huic vniuersali synodo audientiam.

The Emperour permitted vnto the councill to haue the audience of Dioscorus his cause.

Act. 1. fa. 845. col. 2.

The ciuill Magistrates, are first alwayes named, and named the Judges, & sate in the middle as Judges, the Popes Legates wyth others sitting on their lesfe hand, & Dioscorus B. of Alexandria wyth other Bishops sitting on their right hand, & they as Judges ordered the Bishops, and matters of the councill, as appeareth euery where in the whole first, seconde, and last action, and throughtout the whole councill.

They appointed the tymes of ecclesiastical treaties, the councill sueth to them for respect, or more leasure, and they doe graunt it.

Act. 1. fa. 831. col. 1.

Act. 2. fa. 833. col. 1. et 834. col. 2.

Whyles the ciuill Magistrates were presente, the Popes Legates dealt not as chiefe governours: as appeareth.

Act 7. fa. 741. col. 1.

And after that throughout the whole first and seconde action. In the thirde action when the ciuill Magistrates were absent, the Popes Legates begonne to take vpon them, as apeareth.

Act. 3. fa. 835. col. 2.

The ciuill Magistrates controll Lucentius þ̄ Popes Legate, soz that he sitting with other Bishops in the places of Judges, vsed the parte of an accuser, and so they put the sayde Legate to silence. 8.

Act. 1. fa. 741. col. 1.

The ciuill Magistrates, as Judges, pronounced sentence, vpo Diocozus, Juuenalis, Thalasinus, and other Bishops: and the counsel alloweth their sentence, as a god and iust iudgement, and by Christ giuen. 9.

Act. 1. fa. 831.

The Emperour confirmeth þ̄ decrees of the councill. 10.

Act. 3. fa. 864 865. 866.

The Emperours doe absolue Flautiane Archbishop of Constantinople, Eusebius, & Theodoretus, who were condemned by the seconde Ephesens councill, disannulling that decree of their condemnation. 11.

Act. 3. fa. 865 col. 1.

The Bishoppes offenders sue to the Emperour soz mercy. 12.

Act. 2. fa. 834. col. 2. 835. col. 1.

The councill entreateth soz the Emperours pardon to the offenders, the Emperour graunteth it. 13.

Euagrius lib. 2. Cap. 24.

The Emperours make lawes soz men of the cleargy and remoue clerkes offenders. 14.

Act. 3. 863. 866.

The councill Chalcedonense confirmed to the Bishop of Constantinople the second Patriarkate, & next place. 15. Act. 16.

place of dignitie to the Bishop of Rome, and made him equall in all priuileges and dignitie with the B. of Rome, against the saide Bishops of Rome, and his Legates wil, which sheweth y<sup>e</sup> the counsell may determine without his cōsent: & the ciuil magistrates do confirme the same, as appeareth in the .xvi. action of that counsell at large. Yea this .xvi. Action is suche a cutthroate to the Pope, and all Papistes, that they, who doe allowe this whole counsell besides, doe reiect it vtterly, for that it maketh so euidently against their Popes vsurped Tyrannie, which it most plainely discloseth to al the world. Such auctoritie haue these men to retaine and reiect of mooste auncient councelles what pleaseth them: and doe yet in the meane tyme thinke it reason that euerys sentence contayned in their latter leude conuenticles, and false conspiracies, rather than councells, shoulde of necessitie bynde all men. And for that P. Doorman hath before alleaged, and doth here, & hereafter also alleage this counsell, yea and this very .xvi. Action of it, as with them against vs, most falsely and impudently: I wyll here doe him so muche pleasure, as to note out certayne poynts of that .xvi. action truely translate, and that done leave it to the iudgemēt of the discrete reader, whether they make for their Pope and his popish Priests, or for Christian princes auctoritie

Ad. 16. Cōcil.  
Chalcedon.

Dor. fol. 61. b.  
& 62. a.

Ad. 16. fa. 996.  
col. 1.

First, when the Bishop of Romes Legates being desired by the other Bishops in number aboute .600. that they woulde communicate with them about certayne things touching the Constantinopolitane Church, did refuse so to doe, the Bishops of the counsell moued the matter to the Iudges, who were Ciuil Magistrates, and the saide Iudges commaunded the holy counsell to consider the sayde matters.

The

2. The Council of the 600. Bishops, notwithstanding the wilfull absence of the Bishop of Romes Legates, made a decree, agreeable to a former decree made in the first Constantinopolitane council, that the B. of Constantinople should have equall privileges and dignitie, or (as it is termed) maiestie in causes Ecclesiastical with the B. of Rome, which quite overthroweth that Supremacie whiche he now falsely claymeth and vsurpeth over all Bishops.

Ibidem.

3. The Legates of the B. of Rome grieved herewith, at the next assemble come to the Judges, who were Civill Magistrates with these wordes. *If your Magnificence would commaund vs, we have certaine things to shew you. The most glorious iudges sayde: declare what ye will. Then the Legates declared, how the Emperours Lordes of the whole labouring for the Catholike and right faith, had vouchsafed to order that all Churches should holde one sayth: and that no schismes should arise among the Priestcs of God. Howbeit yesterny after that your power, or highnesse rose, and went out of the councell, and our lownesse folowed your steppes, certaine actes are sayd here to be made, which we thinke are besides the Ecclesiasticall Canons and discipline. We desire therfore that your magnificence would commaund those things to be read againe.*

Act. 16. fa. 935. col. 2.

Note thā and now the diversitie of popish phrases.

*Vestra potestas surrexit, nostra humilitas sequuta est.*

The civill magistrates highnesse, and the Popes Legates lownesse, by their owne confession.

Act. 16. fa. 936. col. 1.

Act. 16. fa. 938. col. 1.

*Vtraque pars canones proponant. &c.*

4. Then Beronianus Secretarie of the Council read the decree which the Council of the 600. Bishops had made, agreeable to the decree before made by the council of Constantinople of 150. Bishops, that the B. of Constantinople was in privileges and dignitie equall with the B. of Rome.

5. When the B. of Romes Legates repnyed at thys decree, and the whole stode in defence of it: the moste glorious Judges sayd: let eyther part bring forth their Canons.

mansm

Which

Act 15. fol. 938.  
col. 1.

Which was done accordingly of both parts. Where is to be noted that the B. of Rome Legates brought forth for them onely the 6. and 7. Canons of the Picene councill, so that the 44. forged Cannon of the Picene councill, alleaged by Pope Zozimus his Legates in the Africane councill, which maketh most evidently for the B. of Rome Supremacie, is here not alleaged, nor mencioned, by the Popes Legates, which evidently argueth that them selues knew it was falsified: else woulde they not surely in that distresse haue left so necessarie an helpe vntouched. 6.

Act 16. fol. 940  
col. 1.

Omnem primatū & precipuum honorē conferuari. &c

In conclusion, after long debating of the matter on both sides, the Judges, who were ciuil Magistrates, giue definitiue sentence, that they vnderstand by the alligations of both parties the first rowme amongst the primates, & chiefe honour according to the Canons, to be conserued to the Archbysshop of olde Rome: and that the Archebysshop of the City Emperiall of Constantinople being new Rome, ought to haue, and is worthy of the same honour of Primacie, and power to ordeyne Metropolitane byshops. &c. as hath the B. of Rome. This is their sentence definitiue. Against the whiche though the Legates of the B. of Rome did repine, yet did all the Councill of 600. and moe Bysshops, with one consent allowe the same as a iust sentence and decre. And so the councill was ended. 7.

Post. fol. 62. 2.

Pope P. Dorman taketh occasion of these words: *Omnem quidem primatum, & precipuum honorē antiquę Romę Episcopo conseruari. &c.* that is to saye. That the whole first place amongst the Primates and chiefe honour is conserued to the Archbysshop of Rome: to beate the sumple in hande, that this his Popes Supremacy, which he would now vsurpe oner all Bishops, is therby ment: and to that ende he expoundeth *Omnē Primatum*

Primatum conseruari, all soueraigntie to be confirmed to y Archbysshop of old Rome. But the leudnesse of this surmise, is betrayed by the playne wordes of the decree of the Judges and ciuill Magistrates, here giuing to the Archebysshop of Constantinople new Rome, like and the same honour of Primacie and power, with the B. of olde Rome. And by the former playne wordes of the decree of the whole councell, determining that the most holy See of newe Rome Constantinople, shall enioye equal priuileges, and like maiestie in ecclesiastical matters, as hath the most holy Church of the elder Rome, & to be the seconde after it.

These playne wordes I say, declaring the Sea of Constantinople to haue equal auctoritie and Primacie with the See of Rome, doe shewe that Rome had no other preheminence but only to be in the firste place in order, and Constantinople in the seconde, whereby the fallenesse of M. Dormans surmise, that y B. of Romes Supremacie ouer all Bysshops and the whole Church, as he woulde notwe vsurpe, shoulde by any wordes in this decree be ment.

Further in case the Supremacie which the B. of Rome chalēgeth, ouer al Bysshops, & the whole Church, were hereby ment, as M. Dorman falsely surmiseth, what cause had eyther the Popes Legates then to repine at that decree, or Popes and Papistes notwe to reiect y decree, if y the sayd decree did graunt all that they woulde haue. But such is M. Dormans not dreaming now, but manifest malicious falsifying of the truth.

These things most manifestly appearing in the proccesse of this Councell, and in the history of Cuagrius, with many other matters of waight and substance, as well declaring the chiefe auctoritye of the ciuill Ma-

Act. 16. pag. 940. col. 1.

Eisdem Primatus honoribus & ipsum dignum esse. &c.

Act. 16. pag. 935. col. 1.

Aequis senioris Romæ priuilegijs frui, & in ecclesiasticis, sicut illam maiestatem habere negotijs, & secundam post illā existere.

gistrates ouer the byshops assembled, and in matters treated in this Calcedonense Councell: as also manifestly betraying the vsurped supremacie of the B. of Rome ouer all other Byshoppes, vnto whom the B. of Constantinople is in this councell declared to be equal: howsoeuer M. Dozman woulde vntreuely qualifie the waight of the ciuill magistrates iudgement, by the light terme of cōsenting, I doubt nothing, but the substance of the matter shal haue the due waight of auctoritie in the reasonable readers mynde alwayes.

*Dozm.in.fol.44.*

The next proufe that they bring, is out of the thirde councell Constant of Constantinople, where Constantinus (they say) did not onely set amongst the Byshoppes, but subscribed also with them to the Councell.

To this I answer, that this being graunted that Constantinus sat in the Councell and subscribed also thereto, neyther weakeneth our parte, nor strengtheth theirs. For who euer yet denyed that Christian Emperours might not be present at the Councells, yea and subscribe therevnto also? The thing wherein we differ from them is, in the onely maner of subscribing. For we say that the Byshops subscribed, as defining and iudging, the Emperours, as following and consenting: that the Byshops are necessary parsonnes in the Councelles, as without whome they can not be kept, that the Emperours are ornāmetes & not of the substance. The which difference of their presence, and the cause thereof there, if it were by no place else to be proued, this onely testimome whiche I will here allege of the Councell of Calcedon, written by the whole consente of Papā Leo the fathers and others there assembled, to Leo then Pope, where they all professed that he (as the heade) was in his Legats that there supplied his roome, of all the rest (as membres) the gouernour: and that the Emperours gouerned there ad ornandum, to be an ornament: would be sufficient to persuade.

This

Trāslated out  
of Hos<sup>o</sup> word  
for word. li. 2.  
fol. 116. a.  
D. Hard. Con-  
fut. Apol. fol.  
306. b. hath  
the same.

The diff-  
rence be-  
twene th  
Bishops s  
cribing  
the Couc  
and the E  
perours.  
Ex relati  
Synod. C  
cedon ad  
Papā Leo  
Howe th  
Emperou  
gouernent  
in the Co  
cell is to b  
vnderstan

one. Con-  
antinopol.  
Act. 13.

ore the  
ference  
wene the  
shops and  
e Empe-  
urs sub-  
ptions in  
e olde  
uncels.

2. 15.

This thing woulde also most manifestly haue appeared, if our aduersaries had faithfully alleaged the wordes which the emperour used in subscribing, which were (after the subscriptio of all the Bishops, a hundert & seuentie in nuber) these, Legimus & cōsensimus. We haue reade & giue our cōsent. Whereas the subscriptio of euery Bysshope was Definiens subscripsi, I defining haue subscribed. And thus should they if they will needes glory of the Emperours subscribing haue alleaged this example, that thereby might haue bene perceyued, the manifest difference betwene cōsenting in the one, and defining in the other: that men might yet at the least haue wondred, if Emperours and Kings bare the sway in Religion, and ruled all, if the Bysshops and Priests were their vnderlings and governed by them, what should then meane that straunge manner of subscribing in them that shoulde leade and rule, to saye they subscribe consenting, where as the bishoppes that shoulde be ruled by them, write that they subscribe determining, and defining.

And thus muche touching the diuersitie of subscribing, betwene the Bysshops and the Emperours: whereby many easily be iudged, what authoritie the Emperour and ciuill Magistrat had in the Councell. As for the other difference wherein they and we varie that the Emperours presence in the Councell, is not of the substance thereof, as is the Bysshops, they I thinke them selues, (except they wil say that the first Councel assembled after Christes ascension in Ierusalem, was of no force: or of lesse, as though there were not all the parsons necessarie for the holding thereof) will not deny. No more than we doe this, that Emperours haue used to be present at such councelles, as haue bene kept, and subscribed also thereto, but alwayes as for the surer confirmation, and trustye execution (and yet not that with the better sort neither, but with such as regarded more, and stode in greater awe of present punishment in this world, than of Gods indignation in an other) of such things, as were agreed vpon there: that they seing the Emperours and Rulers of the world (in worldly matters) assenting therunto: that the which they feared not in the Bysshoppes and Priestes, Propter cōscientiam,

Translated out  
of Hosius. lib.  
2. 116. 2.

This is taken  
out of Hosius  
lib. 2. fol. 118. b  
& 119. 2. b.

they might feare in the ciuill Magistrates, propter iram.

Nowell.

Hosi<sup>9</sup> fol. 116. a  
Hard. Con-  
fut. Apol. 316. b

This answer of the diuersitie of subscribing, as all other things, *M. Dozman* hath borrowed of *Hosius*: & so hath his Maister *D. Harding* also. And *M. Dozman* as before, so here also findeth fault, that the Apologie wytyng onely thre lynes of this thirde Constantinopolitane councell, hath not alleaged the wordes vsed in subscriptions as well by the Emperour, as by the Bishops, so fully, as to him had seemed good. And for the commoditie of this his vsuall and most reasonable quarrell, (as he vnreasonablely pretendeth) being offered him by the great breuitie of the Apologie, he chiefly chose to answer certayne places of it. But that the Apologie onely for breuitie sake and vpon no fraude, omitted the same, may appeare by this, that the Apologie by the necessitie of the same breuitie, omitteth verie manie things most playnely making for the authoritie of Christiā Princes: as may appeare by these notes here folow.

Sexti Synodi  
Act. 1.  
Franciscus Io-  
uerius in sex-  
ti synodi pro-  
pugnaculo,  
acknowledged  
geth the same

The Emperour *Constantinus* sate in the middle, and was president of the councell, and the Legates of the Bishop of Rome sate vpon his lefte hand. This is a matter of suche waight, that *M. Dozman*, who maketh so high matters of lowe stoules, and courtesies in sitting (as before appeareth) would neuer haue let it scape him, had he bene of councell in the wytyng of the Apologie. And yet the simple Apologie onely saith, *The ciuill Magistrate, sate amongst the Bishops*. And neuer a worde more of this sitting. No doubt the Authour of the Apologie handleth his matters slenderly, in comparison of *M. Dozman*s diligent doings.

The Judges in that councell were lay men, who orde-  
red

dered the whole councell vnder the Emperour.

3. Agatho the Bishop of Rome wyrteth most humblye to Constantinus the Emperour, as to his superiour, and gracious Lorde.

4. And which is cutt:rote of all other, this councell condemneth Honorius Bishop of Rome for an Heretique: wherby it followeth that the Pope may not onely erre, but also be an Heretique, and may therfoze be condemned. Which to say, is with these men, moze than peccatum in spiritum sanctum.

All this which I haue sayde of this councell, as it is most manifest in the long processe of that councel: so is it confessed by Franciscus Jouerius Doctor of Diuinitie in the vniuersitie of Paris, and collectour of the sines of all councels, in his defence of this Constantianopolitane councell. For many, euen Catholikes, sayth Jouerius, offended with these theude poyntes in that councell, woulde haue thrust it out of the dozes, rather than suche a mischiefe against their holy Father should throughe it fall out. But as Jouerius confesseth it to be a thing vndoubted, y the sirt councel condemned Pope Honorius, yea and iustly condemned him also, so doth Cardinal Hosius and other Papistes, to salue this matter, say, that the Actes of this sirt councell, as muche as do touche Pope Honorius, are falsified. And what else, if they touche a false Pope, but they must nedes be falsified God worte. And some other Papists, for the moze safetie, woulde haue this whole councell blotted out, as witnesseth Jouerius, as they all doe blotte out the rrbij. Canon of the Chalcedonense councell agreed vpon by aboue. 600. Bishops, onely for y it maketh againt their Popes supremacie. And these be they, who doe obiect vnto vs dissentions, agræing so well them selues: and who doe thinke it reason that enery sentece of their

In Sixti Syno-  
di propugna-  
culo, fol. 68.  
fa. 1.

Lib. 2. fa. 116. b

late conspiracles, rather than counceles, though manifest against Gods worde, shoulde binde vs, whereas themselves, vpon light occasions, doe reserue whole ancient generall Councils.

Howe where as the Apologie omitteth all these things touching the Emperours chiefe gouernement in that Council, and the condemning of Pope Honorius by that Council, with other matters of more weyght, than are P. Dozmans, definiens, and consentiens, we shoulde haue more iust cause to complaine vpon the Apologie, than hath P. Dozman in case so manye matters might haue bene placed in so selue, that is, in thre onely lynes. Howe I truste P. Dozmans difference betwene definiens and consentiens subscripsi, will hardely answere these points of that Council evidently declaring y<sup>e</sup> Emperours superiortie ouer Bishops, and in the gouerning of the said Council, in any reasonable mans iudgement.

Further, this custome of the subscribing of the Bishops, definiens subscripsi, *i. definiens haue subscribed*, was vsed by no Bishop in any of the first thre general Councilles, the Nicene, Constantinopolitan, or Ephesene Councilles, which are of most estimation and authority, but was brought in afterwarde, by a newe inuention (as the Bishops continually more, and more, encroched vnto them authority, and toke away as fast from Princes) and therfore is such maner of subscription of lesse authority. And if P. Dozman will proue any superiortie of Bishops ouer the Emperour by this subscription vsed in this Council at Constantinople, I will reprove it by the thre first generall Councilles, where no suche subscription was vsed. And what can any Bishop define I pray you in matters of Religion, vnlesse

vnlesse he can shewe it to agree w<sup>th</sup> Gods holy word, which if he can doe, it is defined therein well enoughe without his definition: And if the Pope and Bishops will without the warrant of Gods worde subscribe definiens subscripsi: *I definiens haue subscribed.* I trust, it shal happē to them, as it did to Dioscorus Archeb<sup>sh</sup>op of Alexandria, and to Iuuenalis Archeb<sup>sh</sup>op of Ierusalem, and to Dominus Archeb<sup>sh</sup>op of Antiochia, & to Thalastius Archeb<sup>sh</sup>op of Cesaria, with other their coplices, who b<sup>si</sup>ng first (that I can reade of) this insolent forme definiens subscripsi, *I definiens haue subscribed,* in that their wicked second Ephesene Synode, had their definitions vndone, & condemned, as well by the Chalcedonense councill assembled by the Emperours Valentinian and Martian, as by the sayde Emperours them selues as wicked subscriptions, defining against Gods worde. And in case matters confirmed in the Sixt Council, which is (as I haue sayde) reiecte of manye Papisses, be of god auctoritie, for that. 289. Bishops subscribed therevnto, every one, definiens subscripsi. Why doe these Papisses reiecte the. 28. Cannon of the Chalcedonense Council making the Bishop of Constantinople equal in dignity with the Bishop of Rome, seing the same was confirmed by. 600. and moe godlye Bishops, every of thē subscribing definiens subscripsi, *I definiens haue subscribed*: Or why doe many euen the chiefe of the Papisses reiecte the condemnation of Pope Honorius in the same Sixt Council, confirmed by the same subscription definiens subscripsi, of. 289. Bishops: Is such subscription onelye of waight, when it maketh against Princes, and of no waight when it maketh against Popes: I may therfore reasonably conclude, that that forme of subscribing definiens subscripsi, not

Vt testatur  
Con. Calcedon.  
Act 1. fa. 830  
col. 2.

Chalcedon.  
Concil. Act. 1.  
fa. 865.

not vsed in the best Councelles, vsed in wicked Councels, refused by Papistes when pleaseth them, is fondly vsed by M. Dozman, thereby to proue any superiortie of Bishops, or inferiortie of Emperours, or any other matter of waight. He may as well proue the Bishop of Rome his vniuersall Dominion ouer the Church, as doth Hosius, by the subscription of his Legates craftely begonne in that Calcedonense Councell, and boldely after vsed in later times, Paschasin<sup>o</sup> vice beatiss. atque Apostolici vniuersalis Ecclesie Papæ vrbis Romæ Leonis. &c. subscripsi. Ego Donatus obtinens locū Domini mei Adriani Pontificis & vniuersalis Papæ subscripsi. That is: *I Paschasinus in steade of the moste blessed and Apostolike vniuersall Pope of the Church of Rome, or Pope of the vniuersall Church of Rome Leo. I Donatus holding the place of my Lorde Adriane, Bishop and vniuersall Pope, haue subscribed.* where this worde vniuersalis in the first subscription standeth so indifferently, that it may be referred epyther to the word Ecclesie, or Papæ: in the latter it playnely maketh the Bishop of Rome vniuersall Pope, which Gregorie the first, though bishop of Rome himselfe, sayth, is a proude, and wicked tytle, sauouring of ambition and Antichristianisme. And in dede the Papistes may proue what they list by suche subscriptions of Bishops, cræping in, in those latter corrupt tymes, by the affectiō, or ambitiō of euery Bishop. But in case Definiēs subscripsi or decernens subscripsi (which some doe vse) I defining, or discerning haue subscribed, be (as it ought to be) vnderstanded, that I bpō diligent search of Gods worde, and considerate waying of the matters with other Bishoppes of the Councell, discerning or iudging in my conscience, this to be true, haue in token therof subscribed, I would not be against such subscriptions. Neyther is the Emperours subscription last bpō

Hosius lib. 2.  
fol. 119. a.  
Concil. Calcedon. Act. 3. fa.  
378. col. 1.

Gregor. lib. 4.  
epistola. 39. &  
34.

on sight and biew of the same, legimus & consentimus, we haue read and giuen our consent, any more prejudiciall to the Emperours auzhoritie, than it is to the Princes auzhoritie, last of all to giue their royall assent, or consent vnto actes of Parliament, long befoze debated and agreed vpon by the Lordes and Commôs: neither doth the one any more proue the Emperour inferiour in auzhoritie to the Bishops of the Council, than doth the other proue princes inferiours to the Lordes and Commons of the two houses of the Parliament, who are in dede the Princes subiectes. The wordes therefore definiens or decernens, defining or discerning (for all is to one effecte) are to be referred to the diligent search, beating & waying of the matter, & not to any auzhoritie or superiouritie of Bishops ouer Christian Princes. If they meane otherwise by such subscribing, they meane naught, but false encroching and vsurping, long, and to long by the Pope and his Prelates nowe practised.

For the wordes Mandamus, præcipimus, iubemus, decernimus, iudicamus, confirmamus, permitimus, that is to say, we will, we commaunde, and charge, we decerne, iudge, confirme, permit, vsed by Emperours, in summoning of Councils, & by the ciuil Magistrates, being Judges in ordering, and governing of coucels, and by Emperours licencing of Councils to deale in matters Ecclesiasticall confirming of Councilles, and licencing Bishops to departe, as they commaunded them to come, with other many most manifest wordes, actes, and matters in auncient councilles at large declaring their superiouritie, and by me partely touched in the procelle befoze, can not by any latter vndercreeping subscriptions, of encroching Prelates, be disa-

St

nulled

nulled, or at all hindered.

Quibus sicut  
caput membris  
ad ornandum.

Touching M. Doymans other difference that the Emperours presence is not of necessitie, or substance of the councell, as is the Bishops, but for an ornament onely. Which thing he goeth about to proue by running backe to a place of the Calcedonense Councell, I trust the good reader, that hath perused a fewe the last leaues of myne answer nexte before to the Calcedonense Councell by him alleaged shall be fully satisfied, concerning these wordes, that the Bishop of Rome should be ouer them as the heade ouer the members and that the Emperours governed to be an ornament. And whosoever will reade and consider the processe of the sayde Calcedonense councell, wherin the Ciuil Magistrates being Judges, did with chiefe authoritie governe and rule the Bishop of Rome his Legates, and that whole Coūcel: or whosoever will reade and consider the processe of the first Nicene great, and most holy councell, shall well know that this distinction that Bishops be of the substance of the Councell, and y<sup>e</sup> the Emperours & Princes are in councell onely for an ornament, is an vnttrue distinction. For though that Councell was assembled and gathered of Bishops, who otherwile were very vertuous men, yet were they at suche variaunce amongst themselves, that they could not possiblie haue agreed, had not the excellent wisdom, and great authoritie of Constantine the Emperour stayed them, and finished their quarrellings, and by chiefe gouernance ordered them, & the whole councell. And sure he that will well consider the processe of that councell, shall well know, that the sayde Bishops had brought that councel to a worse substance, and in dede to a thing of naught, had not the necessarie helpe, and ayde of the Emperour bene, whose presence was not onely for an ornament as sayth M. Doyman,

but

but of mere necessitie there requisite. In so much, that Eusebius who knewe the case somewhat better than doth M. Dozman, affirmeth, that Constantine the Emperour alone of all mortall men was to be founde that coulde bying those horrible dissentions of the Church to a good ende. And this is matter of moze effect, to proue the Emperours presence, or his Deputies for him, to be of necessitie in council, with chiefe auctoritie, than is any forged flatterie of the Popes headshippe, or the Emperours presence ad ornandum, thrust into an Epistle of the councill Chalcedonense to the Bishop of Rome by Kullicus his owne Deacon, or some other Romishe Surueier of the sayde councill. And as leude is M. Dozmans distinction of *fearing of Bishops and Priestes for conscience, and fearing of ciuill Magistrates for wrath*. For whereas the worde of God commaundeth obedience to ciuill Magistrates, as wel for conscience, as for wrath: by this distinction M. Dozman woulde spoyle the ciuill Magistrate of the one of them, & the chiefe one too, contrarie to the Scriptures. And as lendly attributeth he feare to his Bishops: whose behauiour in deede is such, that they are rather as cruell Tirauntes to be feared, than to be loued as godly Bishops. For M. Dozmans reason against Emperours presence, as not necessarie, nor of substance in councils, for that the councill of the Apostles at Jerusalem was of good force, though the Emperour was not there, I like well ynough. I trust we may also haue councils of good force and auctoritie without the presence of the Bishoppe of Rome, for sure neyther he, nor anye his Deputies were there. For though Peter were there, yet was he not then Bishop of Rome, and therfore it followeth that the Bishop of Romes presence, is not of necessity, nor substance,

Lib. 3. de vita  
Constant. pag.  
188. & 189.

Vide Act. 1.  
Concil. Chal.  
fa. 231. col. 2.

Rom. 13.

no: for the ornament neyther of the counsell, but to the mischief and euill of al good counsell, and Godly counsels. And I pray M. Dozman to shewe vs who was in y<sup>e</sup> holy counsell of the Apostles, as the head ouer the membres, where with he is so busie. Surely who so euer he was, he was not bishop of Rome: for there was then no Bishop of Rome. Wherefoze seing it pleaseth M. Dozman to take example of that counsell of the Apostles, to shew therby, what persons are of the necessitie and substance of counsels, and what persones onely for ornament. I trust the Bishop of Rome his presence at counsell is neyther of necessitie, no: of the substance of y<sup>e</sup> counsels, no: as any ornament, much lesse is he necessarie, as the heade to rule, and to be ouer all other Bishops as the membres: who in deede is neyther head no: membre in any good or godly counsell, what place and rule so euer he kepe and beare in the Synagoge of Antechrist.

Sicut caput  
membri pra-  
erat.

Dorman. fol. 45.

Translated  
worde for  
worde out of  
Hosius. lib. 2.  
fol. 116. a.

Quod aliquot  
ante seculis,  
etiam in Au-  
raicano secu-  
do concilio fac-  
tum legimus,  
a viris quibus-  
dam illustri-  
bus. &c.  
ad verbum.  
D. Harding

Thus denye we not that many yeres before this, in the second councel Con. 2. Au-  
raicanum  
Aurricane subscribed to the doings of the counsell, those notable  
lay men (the example also of whome our aduersaries obiekt against  
vs) Petrus, Marcellinus, Felix and Liberius. But o  
Lorde God, I woulde once at the length, they woulde alleage suche  
things as they bring against vs, simply, truly, and as they finde  
them in the originals with their circumstances. Then should they  
haue tolde vs, that as these men subscribed to the counsell: so was  
it by licence of the Fathers. Then would we haue asked of them, why  
bring you then to vs that example, that maketh not onely not at all  
for you, but also muche against you.

But howe I proue this perhappes you will aske. Forsooth by the  
actes of the same Councell, about the ende thereof. Where I finde  
these wordes spoken by the Fathers. Et quia definitionem  
antiquo-

lowe the  
ay me sub-  
scribed in  
the counsell  
Aurifican.

antiquorū patrum nostramque, que suprascripta est, non solum religionis, sed etiam Laicis medicamentum esse & desideramus & cupimus: Placuit, vt etiam illustres ac magnifici viri, qui nobiscum ad præfatam festiuitatē conuenerunt, propria manu subscriberent. *And for as muche saye they as our desire is, that those things which be aboue written, defined of olde tyme by the auncient fathers, and nowe presently by vs, shoulde be not to the cleargie onely auailable, but to the profite and health of the laytie also: it pleaseth vs, that those noble men that haue bene assembled with vs at this present counsell or solemnitie, shoulde also with their owne hands, subscribe to the actes thereof.*

answereth as  
doth Hosius.  
Consut. Apol.  
316. b. 317. a.

Here note I beseeche you good Readers this worde, placuit, it hath pleased vs, or we are content. Is this thinke you a phrase of speech meete for them that can doe no other? If these lay men had subscribed, by their owne right, as hauing an interest thereunto, woulde the Bishops in the counsell haue euer shewed themselues so presumptuously foolish, as to say to them, it pleaseth vs that you subscribe: who might haue answered them by the rule of the lawe, *Eius est velle cuius est nolle*, what tell you vs that you are contented who can neyther will nor chuse, he may onely say he will or is contented, that can say the contrarie, that is, that he will not, or is not contented. Doeth not this place argue most manifestly against them, that the order touching matters of religion, was all in the Bishops handes, as to whose doings they coulde not so much as witness their consent by subscribing, wlesse the Bishops had first consented thereto? yea truly doth it, except we haue of those wise and learned Fathers that opinion, that we thinke they were all starke fooles. As anye man might haue of our counterfeited Bishoppes in England, if they shoulde assemble together and agree, that euerye Baron within the realme shoulde haue a voyce in the Parliamente house.

This therefore being presupposed, as till they be hable to shewe the contrary it must, that those Bishops had their right wittes, and

A REPROVVE OF M.

knewe what they did, this argument holdeth verye well: The Fa-  
thers assembled in the counsell Aurafican were contented, that  
laymen that were there shoulde subscribe to the counsell with the  
clergie. Ergo they might haue chosen. And then how maketh  
the auctoritie of this example for them? Nay who seeth not how  
much it maketh against them?

Nowell.

All this adoe maketh M. Dozman, about the worde  
placuit, it pleased vs, that they should subscribe. And you  
may see what bauntage M. Dozman hath of his studie  
in lawe. Hostius who alleageth this place, and of whom  
M. Dozman hath bozowed, as all other things, so this  
also, coulde not see this placuit or else he had not such a  
speakyng of it, as had M. Dozman, for he maketh no such  
matter of it. But M. Dozman as a iawier, maketh of  
it a lawlike terme, and of very great force, and cometh  
in with a rule of h law. Eius est velle, cui est nolle. He  
may say he will, that can say he will not. And herebpō, he ha-  
peth an aunswere, which the ciuill Magistrates might  
haue made to the Bishops, saying, What tell you vs, that  
you are contented, who can, neyther will, nor choose? Ah good M.  
Dozman, all this adoe needed not betwēne those ciuill  
Magistrates, and those Bishops who came together as  
frendes, (as appeareth in the beginning of the Coun-  
cell) and therefore they would not so stand at the staues  
ende for a worde, & a frendly worde tw: neyther would  
the ciuill Magistrates be displeasēd with the Bishops  
placuit, as you would haue them. Had there bene a cō-  
trouersie betwēne these Bishoppes and the noble men,  
whether they being ciuill Magistrates, should haue sub-  
scribed or no: and therebpon the Bishops, as ending  
the controuersie, had pronounced, Placuit vt etiam il-  
lustres. &c. It pleaseth vs that the noble mē, should also subscribe,  
to the Actes of the Counsell, and the noble men had agreed

The prote-  
stāts exam-  
ple takē o-  
of the coun-  
cell Aurasi-  
can maketh  
against the

Lib. 2. fo. 116. a

Council. Aura-  
fican.

to the same: then might your placuit haue seemed, to haue bene iudicially spoken. But what had you woonne therby, sauing that it was lawful for noble men, & ciuill Magistrates, present at counceils to subscribe to y<sup>e</sup> same, euē by the iudgement of the Bishops, which is nothing against vs, but directly with vs. And had there bene in dede controuersie amongst them, it might haue hapned to some of the Bishops, as it did in the Councell of Calcedonense to your Popes Legates (who as you say, haue the chiefe stroke) contrary to whose placuit, and with their displicant, contrary, I say, to the sayd Legates mindes, and pleasure, y<sup>e</sup>t, to their great displeasure, the ciuill Magistrates iudged, and gaue sentence, at the Councell of 600. Bishops besides, allowing the same. But seeing no suche controuersie was, but great agreement betwene them, why should those noble men for the word placuit, if pleaseth vs, by the bishops spoken, be so displeased, y<sup>e</sup> they should say to the Bishops: What tell you vs, what you are contented, who can, neither will, nor choose? Might not the Bishops, to such a froward saying haue answered reasonably: I pray you be not discountented with vs, for that we are contented with you: and let not an vsual word, by sinistre cōstructing, be drawen to a wrong sense, and occasion of offence betwene vs. But M. Doorman here (vpon what cause it appeareth not) in discoursing vpon his word placuit, toke such a displicant with our Bishops, y<sup>e</sup> he would, nedes call them starks foles: but some, no starks foles, may think M. Doorman not y<sup>e</sup> wisest mā, who he sayned that if our Bishops assembling together, would agree that euery Baron within this Realme should haue a voyce in the Parlyament house, they might be counted starks foles. In dede M. Doorman, it can not come but of an excellent witte, such as you haue, to surmise such a deuise, therevpon to call them starks foles. You had  
a great

Chal. Concil.  
Act. 16.

a great lust to vtter your tearmes, when you soughte such occasions thereto. You say further, that in case those Bishops, assembled at Aurasia, had their ryght wittes, this argument holdeth: *The fathers assembled in the Coucell, were contented that lay men should subscribe to the Coucell: Ergo they might haue chosen.* M. Dozman, what opinion, you haue of those fathers I knowe not, but some madde men doe thinke, that wyle men haue not their right wittes: and the argumēt is such, as one out of his right witt, might righte well haue made. Here is the like. The fathers assembled in the Councell Picene, were cōtented that the Emperour Constantinus, should come in amongst them, & sit in the middle of them. Ergo they might haue chosen, whether he so shoulde haue done or no. And this also: The Fathers of the Lampfacene Councell were contented that the Emperour Valentinianus the elder, should be present with them to intreat of certaine pointes in Religion to be reformed, as M. Dozman confesseth. Ergo they might haue chosen. And so it followeth ȳ epyther ȳ fathers of the Picene Council might haue kept the Emperour Cōstantinus Magnus out of ȳ Councell, which was kept within his owne Pallace: or the fathers of the Lampfacene Councell might haue compelled the Emperour Valentinianus to haue come vnto their Councell, though he refused so to do. They M. Dozman, who catch at such minutes as is this your placuit, and do make exclamation thereat, wyth *O Loyde God*, as though they had found some notable matter for the maintenance of their Poperye, and frame thereof, as vpon good groundes, such arguments to proue those to be of chiefe authoritie, who are content, or not discontent, that a thing be done, they wil play at small game, rather than sit out.

Euseb. de vita  
Constantini  
lib. 3. fol. 189.  
Theodoretus  
lib. 1. cap. 7.

Sozom. lib. 6.  
cap. 6.  
Nicephor. lib.  
11. cap. 3.

I woulde you woulde helpe vs, to frame our argu-  
 mentes. Surely we haue better matter than this your  
 placuit, had we the grace to frame it in such formes, as  
 you can deuise. The Emperours Constantinus, Theo-  
 dosius, Marcianus, willed, commaunded, charged the  
 Bishops, and amongst them the Bishop of Rome, that  
 they vpo the sight of their letters without delay, should  
 come vpon to a place, and at a tyme, by them appointed,  
 (as hath bene before largely declared) Ergo the Empe-  
 rours had both velle and nolle: and it was at the Em-  
 perours pleasures, whether the Bishops should come  
 or no, as those who were at the Emperours commaun-  
 demēt. It pleased the Emperours, when the Councils  
 were done, to giue the Bishops leaue to goe home. Ergo  
 they might haue chosen. It maye be that B. Dozman  
 will yet in these cases, giue the Bishoppes the superio-  
 ritie, quia placuit ipsis venire & redire, for that it plea-  
 sed them to come, and to goe home agayne: vnlesse to  
 saue them from being inferiours, he woulde surmise,  
 that thei came vpon cōmaundement, as doth the Beare  
 to the stake, with their displicuit, not placuit. Againe it  
 pleased the Emperour Constantinus to commaunde,  
 and charge all the Councell, and whole number of Bi-  
 shoppes, assembled at Tyzus, to appeare before him, to  
 giue accomptes of their doyngs, in their owne persons.  
 Ergo the Emperour had the velle & nolle in his power.  
 It pleased h Emperour Marcianus to permit, or giue  
 leaue vnto the. 600. Bishops in the Coucel of Calcedon,  
 to haue the audience of Dioscorus Archbysshop of Alex-  
 andria in his cause. Ergo the Emperours might haue cho-  
 sen. In the same Calcedonense Councell, the Popes Le-  
 gates, desire leaue of the ciuill Magistrates, who were  
 Judges, that they might moue them in a matter done

Sozom. lib. 1.  
cap. 17.

Supra fol. 210.

Euseb. de vita  
Constantini  
lib. 3. fa. 192.  
Theodo. lib. 1.  
cap. 13.

Socrates. lib. 1.  
cap. 32. 34.  
Sozom. lib. 2.  
cap. 25. 28.

Concil Chal-  
ced. A. A. 1 fa.  
845 col. 2.

in that Councell, and the ciuill Magistrates gaue them leaue. Ergo they might haue chosen. The Popes Legates prayed the said ciuill Magistrates, that they would commaunde the things the day befoze done, to be read againe, and they were contented they shoulde be read. Ergo they might haue chosen.

In that Councell al things, are referred to the Emperours arbitrement, and ordering. Ergo the Emperour hath velle and nolle in the matters of y<sup>e</sup> Councell.

And to returne to your owne terme, though the worde placuit be sometime vsed of such as be in auctoritie, that is rather of humilitie, than of inforcing of auctoritie: for auctoritie is better expressed by y<sup>e</sup> wordes sanxcimus, mādamus, præcipimus, iubemus, we order, decre, commaund charge, &c. continually vsed by Emperours, and ciuill Magistrates, in Councils, freedom, or no where by bishops. Wherfoze y<sup>e</sup> word placuit once vsed in a little bte Councell, can make nothing against the manifest auctoritie of Emperours, and ciuill Magistrates, most euidently expressed, not onely by most playne wordes of chiefe auctoritie, but also by notable actes vsed in all generall Councelles, of auncient and good tymes, as I haue befoze partly declared.

*Dorman. fol. 46. 47.*

*It followeth that Iustinian being a Christian Emperour, deposed yet notwithstanding two Popes, Siluerius and Vigilius. Hereby our aduersaries thinke to haue not a little helpe to proue the superioritie of Emperours and Kings, ouer Bysshops, and Priestes. Trulye that Iustinian did this, it is but barely affirmed, nor anye place in the Apologie is there coated where a man that doubted might see it proued. And therefore with the same auctoritie might it be demed, with the which it is proposed to be beleued. True it is,*

*Iustinian.*

*that*

Hofius treateth hereof  
lib. 2. fol. 83.

that Theodora the Emperresse as some write, being altogether giuen to the heresie of Eutiches, after she had long trauayled iustly with Siluerius, and after Vigilus both Bysshopes of Rome, to haue Menna the Catholike Archebysshop of Constantinople deprivied of his Bysshopricke, and the heretike Anthimius remoued by Agapetus before restored againe, and could not obtaine at their handes hir wicked purpose: did vpon displeasure conceyued by this repulse, procure by the meanes of Belilarius, Iustinians chiefe Capitaine, the banishment firste of the one, and after of the other. Whosoever deposeth them, or who soeuer banished them: true is it, that this was the cause thereof and no other. Which being as in dede it is most true, let vs now graunt to our aduersaries that it was not the Emperresse, but the Emperour himselfe that deposeth them: and let vs see how they be able to proue thereby, that Emperours and Kings may degrade Priestes, and depose Bysshops. If they will deale vprightly they must to proue it reaso thus: Iustiniã otherwise a Christian Emperour, but in this point a cruell heretike, tyrannously deposeth two Popes, Siluerius and Vigilus, only because they woulde not do wrong (that is deprivie him of his Bysshopricke) to a Catholike Bysshop, and restore an heretike lawfully before deprivied. Ergo the Emperour is aboue the Pope. Ergo kings be aboue Bysshops. Is not this a proper kinde of reasoning trowe you? Might they not haue reasoned after this sorte that Nero deposeth S. Peter, that Traian put downe Clement, with a number of such lyke examples? For to say that Iustinian was a Christian whereas these were infidels, is but a mist cast into the obiection to chasell our eyes. For who seeth not, if he be not already blinde, that this dede (if it should haue bene Iustinians) to maintaine and defende an open heretike, against a faithfull and true Catholike, had bene the act of a tyrant and infidell, not of a Christian and good Prince, and that it is no better reason to say and conclude that he deposeth them, and therefore iustlye, than it shoulde be to say that he defended the Heretike Anthimius, and therefore rightfully.

Tit. 2.

Nowell

Howbeit thyng  
gare is chiefly  
borrowed  
of Peter Crab,  
by him out of  
the Pontificall  
Beatiff. Silue-  
rius fiduciam  
habens in Do-  
mino, & beato  
Petro, rescrip-  
sit, dicens: Do-  
mina Augusta  
ego rem istam  
nunquam ero  
facturus, vt  
reuoerem ho-  
minem hære-  
ticum, & sua  
nequitia dam-  
natum. &c. in  
simili latini-  
tate papali.  
Tom. 2. Con-  
cil. pag. 1. & 2.

Nowell.

**M.** Dozman chargeth the Apologie, for that it barely affirmeth, that Iustinian the Emperour deposed two Popes without any coiting at all, and therefore it might as easely be denied, as it was affirmed, sayth **M.** Dozman. And by and by he, who is so offended, that threë lines in the Apologie goe vn-coated, hath wriiten threë score lines and more vpon the same matter, and hath sent them abroade, without eyther Coate, or Jerken, starke naked into y<sup>e</sup> wyde world. And he thought it as good so to doe, as to sende them out in y<sup>e</sup> Popes liuerie, least they might be takē to be scarce fast and true, by their liuerie getting discredit with all god & true men: for in dede all this procelle he had out of frater Peter Crabbe his collection, by him taken out of the Popes Pontificall, a booke stuffed with infinite beggerly baggage: the lattine therof, who list read, shal finde very papall and a mate besture or case for so good stuffe. And yet suche as it is, **M.** Dozman was (besides the cause alleaged) afraid to note it, for feare of matter, therby like to fall out against himself. For had he seene Paulus Diaconus, Platina, Phephorus, or Paucle-rus, who intreate all of this matter, he would not haue left his margent so naked for shame, seeing he chargeth an other therewith in this very place. Now it is recozded in the sayd Pontificall, \*that Syluerius, being the sonne of Hormisda Pope of Rome, was by ambition, byberie, force, and feare, made Pope, and not by anye ordinarie meanes. Wherefore vpon this grounde, I do make myne argument, otherwise than **M.** Dozman appointeth, and doe say: that Iustinian a Catholike, and godly Emperour, iustly, and lawfully deposed Silue-rius, a Pope so vnlawfully made, and ordayned, who  
was

Tom. 2. Con-  
cil. pag. 1. 2. &c

\* Ex lib. Pon-  
tificali.  
Silueri<sup>9</sup> ex Pa-  
tre Hormisda  
Episcopo Ro-  
mano leuatus  
est sine deli-  
beratione de-  
creti, per the-  
odatum tyrā-  
num corrup-  
tum pecunia  
dato, sub vi &  
metu, non se-  
cundum more  
antiquum. &c

was Symoniacus, non Apostolicus, sed Apostaticus, a Simoniacke, not Apostolike, but an Apostata, not onely by Gods law, but by the Popes owne <sup>a</sup> Canons to be deposed. And therefore **H. Dozman** doth vnder our name, vntruely, & vniustly charge the godlie Catholike Emperour **Justinian**, *as an Heretique and cruell Tyrant in this poynt, or fact.* Again it is recorded in y<sup>e</sup> same Pontificall, and also in other histories, y<sup>e</sup> certaine, though false witnesses, suborned by **Vigilius** the Deacon, testified that **Siluerius** would haue betrayed the Citie of Rome and **Belisarius** to the King of the Gothes. And that **Belisarius** thereupon, did depose him, and sende him into exile. And that therefore neyther **Justinian** the Emperour, nor **Belisarius** the Captaine, but the false witnesses, and specially **Vigilius** who was Pope after him, were to blame therefore, and that **Siluerius** was vpon suspicion of treason deposed: wherefore it is not so certaine, as **H. Dozman** maketh it, *that it is most true, that Syluerius was deposed, onely for that he would not at the Emperesses pleasure, depose Memna the Patriarke and restore Ambimius, and for no other cause.* Further here is in your Pontificall a shreud example of a Pope made and ordained, by the commandment of the king **Theobatus**, without the consēt of the cleargie. And **Paucerus**, **Sabelicus**, and **Platina** doe testifie, that vntill that tyme, the Popes were made by the Emperours auctoritie.

Touching the other Pope **Vigilius**. It is <sup>d</sup> recorded in the same Pontificall, that he being a Deacon, conspired with the Emperesse, against **Siluerius**, and by false witnesses procuring him to be deposed, by false witness, by falsehood, ambition, treason, & force, came to the Popedom himselfe, and he receyuing **Siluerius** late Pope, as it were, into his tutele, by famine or otherwise cruel

<sup>a</sup> Distin. 69. ca. Si quis.  
<sup>b</sup> Nicephor<sup>us</sup> li. 17. cap. 13. Ex lib. Pontificali falsi testes dixerunt, nos multis vicibus inuenimus **Siluerium** Papam scripta huiusmodi mittentem ad Regem Gothorum: veni ad portam quae vocatur asinaria iuxta lateranas, & Civitatem tibi trado, & **Belisarium** patricium. &c.  
<sup>c</sup> **Naucleus** generatione. 13. **Platina** in vita **Siluerij**. **Theodato** iubente Pontifex creatur, cum antea non Regum sed Imperatorum auctoritas interueniret. &c.  
<sup>d</sup> Tom. 2. Concil pag. 72. &c. In li. pontificali **Augusta** Concilio vsa cum **Vigilio** Diacono. &c.

ly murdered him. And he was besides these popely acts, accused to Iustinian the Emperour, of the murder of his notarie, and of a Wydowes sonne also. And therfoze Vigilius, as he procured Syluerius to be depofed, so was he depofed himfelfe: and as an ambitious man, a Simoniacke, a fuborner of a false witneffe, a Traytour, an inuader, a murderer, and (which you M. Doz- man will confesse the iustest cause of al,) accursed, and damned of Pope Syluerius, most iustly depofed. And Pauclerus and Platina doe expreffely say, that Pope Vigilius was called into the iudgement, for that by his fraud, Pope Siluerius was exiled, and for murder al- so. Wherefoze M. Dozman, this is not so cleare a case as you make it neyther, *that it is most true that Vigilius was depofed onely for that he woulde not deprinc Menna, and restore Anthimus, and for no other cause.* And you doe in this point vnder our name, vntreuely and vniuilly charge the Ca- tholike and godly Prince Iustinian as an heretique, and cru- ell tiraunt in this point and fact also.

This being thus, M. Dozman ruffleth exceedingly with is Ergos. *Iustini an in this poynt a cruell heretique, tis annoufly depofed two Popes, Siluerius, and Vigilius. Ergo the Emperour is aboue the Pope. Ergo kings be aboue Bisshopes. Is not this a proper kind of reasoning, trow you? might they not haue rea- soned after this sorte, that Nero depofed S. Peter, that Tai an put downe Clement, with a number of such like examples? For to saye that Iustini an was a Christian, where as these were infidels, is but a myst cast into the obiection, to dasell our eyes. No godd M. Dozman, not so, but this Iustini an a Christian, Catho- like, righteous, and godly Emperour, (not an heathen, and most cruel tiraunt, as was Pero) depofed Silueri- us & Vigilius (not S. Peter & S. Clement,) two Popes both entring in by ambition, Simonie, force, and vio- lence*

Tom. 2. Con-  
cil. fol. 3. fa. 1.  
In epistola Sil-  
uerij Papæ ad  
Vigilium Pa-  
pam.  
Naucerus ge-  
neratione. 19.  
Platina in Vi-  
gilio.

Fol. 47. 3.

lence, and the one accused to be a Traitor, the other a knowne murtherer : and iustly deposed them, so vniustly both entering into their papacie, and vsing the same. Ergo Christian and Godly Princes may likewise depose Popes and Bishops, who likewise iniustly enter into, or wickedly vse their ecclesiasticall office.

And where al your reason dependeth herebpon, that these Popes were without iust cause deposed, and therefore they were vniustly deposed, by the Emperour : I trust you will graunt, that where iust cause and deserte is in Popes or Bishops, to be deposed, they maye by Christian Princes be iustly deposed : else is the greatest parte, of your necessarie processe left vntouched.

*Dorman. fol. 47.*

*But seeing this example will not serue our aduersaries turne, let vs assay to make it serue ours. And first let vs examine what should be the cause, why Iustinian should be so earnest with these two Bishops of Rome, to depose the B. of Constantinople, & to restore the heretike that stood deprived? was he not Emperour of all the worlde? had he not by the meanes thereof, as our newe doctours beare vs in hande, the chiefe gouernement ouer al matters spirituall and temporall? was on the other side the auctoritie of the Bishops of Rome at that time such, that it extended, I will not saye out of their owne diocesse to any other Bishops in the Latine Church but to Constantinople the chiefe of the Grieke?*

*Here are they taken howsoever they answer. For first if the Emperour had bene of that auctoritie that they saye the laye Magistrates are, why did he not then by his owne mere and absolute power displace the one and place the other? Might he not as well haue deposed one Bishop at Constantinople as two at Rome? But if on the contrarie part they aunswere, that the Pope was he that must necessarilie place and displace, euen at that tyme and in the Grieke Church, and not the Emperour: whye then should it be*

be lawfull at this tyme for Emperours or Kinges to doe that, which was not lawfull to be done then? Or why shoulde it not now be lawfull for the Bisshoppes of Rome, which at those dayes was not un-lawfull?

Thus maye you see good Readers howe this historie wholly and truly alleaged, maketh not onely not against vs, but also much with vs, if it had bene true that the Apologie sayeth, that Iustinian had deposed those two Popes.

Nowell.

This example well serueth our turne, howsoever you woulde haue it to the contrarie: and that I doubt not, but al reasonable readers doe well see.

You examine, what shoulde be the cause, whye Iustinian shoulde be so earnest, with these two Bisshoppes of Rome, to depose the Bisshoppes of Constantinople: and you woulde by suche examination gather, that the Bishop of Romes power extended to Constantinople, and vnto the depriuing of the Patriarkes there. But sir examiner, no such thing is to be founde in the deposition of the witnesses. For who saith that the Emperour Iustiniã was so earnest, with those Popes therabout? You saide euen now, that the Emperesse Theodoza was so earnest with those two Bisshoppes of Rome, you saide not that the Emperour was earnest, neyther sayth the Pontifical your Alcozan so, neyther sayth Sabellicus, Panclerus, nor Platina so, neyther sayeth the Apologie so. The mosse parte of the witnesses saye, that Vigilius a false Deacon, and not Iustinian, was so earnest, therby to creepe into the Popedome himself: but you would find, that Iustiniã shoulde be so earnest, with these two Bisshoppes of Rome, to depose the Bisshoppes of Constantinople. You labourd, euen now, to proue he was not earnest wyth them there about:

AND

and the Apologie I thinke will graunt you, that he was not, and sure I do graunt the same. But the Apologie sayth that Iustinian deposed two Popes: It is true: will you therfoze surmise that the Apologie sayth, that Iustinian was earnest with two Popes of Rome to depose the Bishop of Constantinople: you may well say so: so: you maye well saye, what you list, and no credit wonne no: loss: so: so sayth no man else, that I can heare of. But the Apologie, as it sayth that Iustinian deposed two Popes, without any helpe of the Bishoppe of Constantinople, so meaneth it, that he might, if he so woulde, vpon like iust cause, haue deposed one Bishop of Constantinople without their helpe. Where you speake, as though the Apologie had sayde, the Emperour could not: neyther the Authour of the Apologie, no: any wise man else so sayeth, though M. Doorman doe fondely so surmise. But the Pontificall sayth, that the Emperesse Theodoza was verpe earnest wpyth these Popes, to depose Mennas the Patriarke, & to restore Anthimius the Heretique: but Platina telleth by whose setting on she was so earnest. Instigante Vigilio Diacono, Theodora Augusta Syluerio imperat. &c. At the instigatio or setting on of Vigilius the Deacon (sayth Platina) Theodoza the Emperesse commaunded Syluerius, and that with threathnings, that Mennas being expelled, out of the Citie of Constantinople, he woulde reuoke Anthimius. By this examination of witnesles, it appeareth what should be the cause, why (not Iustinian as you M. Doorman, by your examination would finde, no: Theodoza the Emperesse neyther of her owne mynde, as you beare the readers in hand, but Vigilius the Deacon was so earnest with the Emperesse, not so much to put Mennas out of his bishopricke

Tom. 2. Con-  
cil. fa. 1. & 2.

Platini de vita  
Syluerij.

of Constantinople, as to finde a quarell to put Siluerius out of his Bishoprike of Rome. And why forsooth? That he himselfe might be placed in his rowme. And so in this examinatio it falleth out in seeking of causes, that one ambitious and false captife, sought earnestly to put out an other, that he might crepe into this place: and with all, the vertues of the Romish Popes, ambition, byberie, falshode, force, & murder with suche other vsuall ornamentes of the sitters in that see, doe in the same examination come to light. And yet sayeth M. Dozman: *Here are they taken, what soeuer they answer: such a net hath this man set for vs: and he asketh the question: Whye the Emperour could not as well by his auctoritie depose one Bishop at Constantinople as two at Rome? To the which I aunswere, he might, had he had like cause: had there bene as false practisers, and ambitious clearkes, in the Graeke cleargie, as was in the Romishe Courte: had there bene one Graeke Deacon, as ready, and hable by false suggestion to delude the wise Emperour Iustinian, as there was a Romaine Deacon, ready to fattle benemously in a womans care: had there bene in the Patriarke Pennas, that godly and vertuous Bishop, suche ungodlyneste and vice, as were in these two Romaine Popes: had there bene such ambitio, corruptio, byberie, falshode, treason, force, murder, in Pennas, as was in Siluerius, and Vigilius: why I praye you, might not Iustinian the Emperour as well haue deposed one Bishop at Constantinople as he deposed two at Rome? to aunswere you by your owne question. For was he not as hable, and of as good auctoritie at Constantinople, where his chiefe habilitie, and auctoritie was, where him selfe was also personally presente, against one Bishoppe of Constantinople, as he was against two*

at

at Rome, where he had lesse power and auctoritie, than at Constantinople, and where he was not presente, as he was at Constantinople? But he deposed two Bishoppes of Rome: Ergo he might, had he had like cause, haue deposed one at Constantinople. If you will saye he might not: what meane you? woulde you make one Bishop of Constantinople of greater auctoritie, & harder to be deposed, than two Popes of Rome? Take hede what you doe man, for Gods sake, but it is not so straunge a thing for Emperours, to depose Bishops of Rome, or of Constantinople, or of other Sees, as M. Dozman woulde haue it seeme, as I also haue partely befoze declared. But you will vze the words of the Pontificall, and of Platina who say that the Emperesse woulde haue had Siluerius, and Vigilius to remove Penna, and to reuoke Anthimius, &c. why, what is that else, but that she woulde haue the testimonte of those men, who were in the cleargie of great estimation, and auctoritie, with Anthimius, and against Pennas, thereby to induce the Emperour hir husbände to depose Pennas. For where Platina saith that the Emperesse, was in hand with Siluerius, that Penna should be thruste out of the Citie of Constantinople: all the worlde maye knowe that he shoulde be but a meane thereto: and that the Patriarke of Constantinople coulde by no meanes, but by the Emperours auctoritie be expelled the Cytie. And this Anthimius was befoze displaced by Agapetus Bishop of Rome being at Constantinople: but howe displaced, by him? not so, be you sure, that the Bishoppe of Rome, who was there but one of King Theodatus his Legates (which is also a shrewde president against you M. Dozman) did beare the chiefe sway in the Church, and Citie of Constanti-

Supra 224. 30  
&c.

Vt pulso men-  
na ab vrbe  
Constanti. &c.

Nicephor<sup>o</sup> li.  
17. cap. 9.  
Nauclerus ge-  
neratione. 18.

He is in diuers  
writers named  
Anthem<sup>o</sup>, An-  
thimius and  
Anthemius.

Nicephorus  
lib. 17. cap. 21.

people, otherwise than by Iustinian the Emperours ap-  
pointment: who by his commaundement assembled a  
Synode of Bysshops, and hearde Agapetus and Anthi-  
mius dispute, and allowed Agapetus his doctrine, and  
disallowed the doctrine of Anthimius: and that done,  
desired Agapetus to ordayne a Catholike Bysshop at  
Constantinople, who ordayned this Pennas. And so  
might Theodoza the Emperesse deale with Syluester,  
and Vigilius, to perswade the Emperour against Pen-  
nas, with Anthimius, and by the Emperours consent  
and auctoritie depose or ordayne a Byschoppe, I denye  
not. And well might the Emperesse attempt that way,  
seing that the Emperour hir husbände had so great fa-  
uour to Agapetus first, and to Syluester and Vigilius  
also a greate whyle. Yea and if it will please you to  
looke vpon Nicephorus, you maye finde that this Vigi-  
lius Bysshop of Rome did insolently and proudly exco-  
municate Pennas Bysshop of Cōstantinople, and that  
Pennas excommunicated the Bysshop of Rome againe,  
and that Iustinianus the Emperour toke parte wyth  
Pēnas against the byshop of Rome, and that therevpon  
he fledde into the Church. What preferment I praye  
you had the B. of Rome then aboute the Bishop of Con-  
stantinople, when eyther of them excommunicate other?  
And if Nicephorus iudged it a proude acte of the B. of  
Rome to excommunicate the B. of Constantinople, he  
was not of your iudgement, who doe thinke that the  
B. of Rome might well depose the B. of Constanti-  
nople. And you may note if you will, that as here when  
the Emperour fauoured Pēnas the Bysshop of Con-  
stantinople, in a iust cause against Vigilius the By-  
shop of Rome, the Bysshop of Cōstantinople had the su-  
perior and better parte, or hande: so before, when the  
same

same Emperour favoured Anastasius byshop of Rome  
 in the truth, against the Bishop of Constantinople An-  
 thimus, the Bishop of Rome had the superiortie: and  
 that therefore the superiortie standeth absolutely in  
 the truth not in Sæs, and that amongst men, the  
 chiefe authoritie is in the godly Emperour:

*Dorm. in. fol. 48.*

Yea but say they you can not deny, that the Emperour made  
 lawes of matters of religion, that he abstained not even in matters  
 of the church, from these termes, Sancimus, iubemus, we or-  
 daine, we commaunde, with such like. Trulie this can I not denie,  
 and if I would there be whole constitutions of his, ready to be brought  
 against me: as that where he commaundeth that none be made Bi-  
 shop that hath a wife, and of them that have had, such as have had  
 onely one, the same no widow, neither divorced from hir husband,  
 neither forbidden by the holie canons: and also that, where he co-  
 mmaundeth that of Priestes no other be receiued to that order, but  
 such as vel coelibem vitam agunt, vel vxoré habue-  
 runt, aut habent legitimam, & eam vnam & primã,  
 neque viduam, neque diuortio separatã a viro, aut  
 alioqui legibus aut sacris interdictam canonibus,  
 that is to saie: as either leade a single life, or haue had a lawefull  
 wife, or presently haue, and that one and the first, no widow, none  
 divorced from hir husband or otherwise by the lawes or holie ca-  
 nons forbidden: and that of deacons also, where he giueth commaun-  
 dement, that if he that shoulde be Deacon, haue no wife present-  
 ly, he be not otherwise promoted, excepte being firste asked of him  
 which giueth the orders, whether he can frõ thenceforth liue with-  
 out a wife, he answer yea. In so much that the Emperour plainly  
 pronounceth, that he that ministrerh to him the orders can not dis-  
 pence with him to marry after, & that if he should so doe the Bishop  
 which suffred it should be deposed.

A REPROVVE OF M

Nowell.

**M.** Dozman is dviuen to confesse that *Iustinianus* the Emperour did make lawes, in matters of Religion, and that he abstayned not euen in the matters of the Church from these termes, *Sanxcimus, iubemus, &c.* we ordeyne, we commaunde, with such like, as *decernimus, constituimus, præcipimus, mandamus.* &c. we decerne or decree, we constitute, we determine, we commaunde, we charge, with all other termes of chief authoritie, in law making possible to be vsed: the which seeing *Iustinian* did vse ordinarily, in making of ecclesiasticall lawes, it is thereby most evidently declared, that the Emperour *Iustinian* had vsed the chiefe gouernement ouer persons, and in matters ecclesiasticall. But **M.** Dozman thinketh that he doth well shifte off all this, by making mention of a constitution of his, made concerning the mariage of ecclesiasticall Ministers: that as he began this treatie, so he may ende the same with some inuectiue agaynst the lawefull mariage of Ecclesiasticall ministers. But touching the bysteries, symmonies, ignorance, couetousnesse, concubines, in the same lawe to priestes forbidden, **M.** Dozman speaketh neuer a worde. But seeing I haue sufficiently sayde befoze, in the beginning of this treatie, concerning the mariage of ecclesiasticall ministers, there is no cause why, I should now againe trouble the reader therewith, specially seeing it is a matter altogether impertinent, to this his treatie, of the beade of the Church to be a Priest.

Thus much I may by the way admonishe the good Reader, that suche constitutions as *Iustinian* made, touching this matter, concerned those, who had solenely promised in their owne persons befoze their Bishop neuer to marry, and therefore pertayne not to our cleargie

Supra fo. 9. 10.  
&c.

cleargy of England, who haue made no such promise. And it is by the aduersaries confessed, and in the lawe it selfe it evidently appeareth, that suche constitutions and ordinaunces be not Goddes, but mannes lawes: which (as it vsuallye happeneth to other humane constitutions) maye by man be broken againe, vpon iust causes: suche as the popishe Notaries, by their moste vile lyfe, haue gyuen greate, and too greate, to Princes, and all other men that doe loue honestie, of what Religion so euer they be. In somuche that the Duke of Banare, latelye in his visitacion of the cleargie of his owne Dominions, vnderstanding their filthy concubinate, and beastly life not to be named, wherevpon honest learned Catholikes also doe abhorre their fellowship (as he saith) in an oration in his name made to the late Councell at Trident, and nowe extant in prynt, confesseth the same: and therevpon maketh his humble sute to the Coucell, that seeing Priestes are not by gods lawe bounden to liue a sole life, and seeing that in the Primitive Church married men were Priestes and Bishops, as by the histories ecclesiasticall it appeareth (saith he) it might now also be permitted, that all ecclesiasticall ministers that woulde, might marrie: that suche filthy abominations myghte be thereby remoued. And to thys sute he ioyneth that the Sacrament might be ministrered in both kindes. And as I before noted, the most honest and best learned of the Papistes, yea suche as haue bene Popes them selues, vpon knowledg of the beastlinesse of their sayde Popishe Notaries, haue wished that it were so permitted. And Mr. Dorman if he woulde, might haue learned the same, by his booke of lawe, and the same booke of the lawe too, out of the which he hath take this place. Where it is agreeable to gods lawe

Impressum  
Colonię apud  
hæredes Ar-  
noldi Brick-  
manni. 1565.  
cum gratia &  
priuilegio Cę-  
sarię Maiest.

Supra fol. 102

1. cor. 7.  
Authent. col. 1  
de non elig.  
secundo nub.  
tit. 2. in glosa,

latwe confessed, Quod nubere est consultius quam vri.  
that it is better to marrie than to burie : specially so beaſtlye,  
as your popiſhe Notar ies doe.

Now whereas **M. Dozman** of all the ecclesiastical  
lawes, by **Justinian** the Emperoz made, which are ex-  
ceeding many, maketh mention onely of his constitu-  
tion cöcerning the mariage of Ministers, and touching  
the first place of his Pope, so that he perceyved those  
onely to be to his purpose : I will doe him this plea-  
sure, to helpe him out with the Kalender of part of **Ju-  
stinians** lawes ecclesiastical : wherby al reasonable men  
may well vnderstande his chiefe auzhoritie ouer per-  
sons, and in causes ecclesiastical.

Col. li. i. ti. 17.  
Legum auto-  
ritas & diui-  
nas & huma-  
nas res bene  
disponit.

**Justinian** the Emperour declaring that the auzho-  
ritie of the lawes doth well dispose & order ecclesiastical  
and diuine matters, as well as worldly and humane  
things, both caused y<sup>e</sup> aücient lawes ecclesiastical made  
by the emperozs his pzedecessors to be collected & gathe-  
red together, and partly mended & coꝛrected the same,  
according as times, and occasions required : & made o-  
ther newe lawes ecclesiastical him selfe, declaring his  
chiefe auzhoritie in ecclesiastical matters. Now vpon  
the occasion that many offered willingly to leade a  
sole lyfe in the ministerie ecclesiastical in those dayes,  
which, for the lacke of cares and troubles in that kinde  
of lyfe, seemed then to be expedient, **Justinian** thought  
god amongst many others, to make also a constitutio<sup>n</sup> or  
law ecclesiastical cöcerning the ministers of y<sup>e</sup> Church,  
to abstaine fro mariage, or to remaine with one onely  
wife at the most : as doth by the place, by **M. Dozman**  
here alleaged appeare : wherewith I will first beginne.  
The lawe out of the which **M. Dozman** take his certe  
here alleaged, is thus in effeate. Sancimus quoties  
opus fuerit episcopum ordinari, &c. That is to say, we

Authent. col. 9  
tit. 15. De sac-  
riss. episc. &c.

doe

doe decree that as often as it is necessarie, that a Bishoppe be ordained, the Clarke, and chiefe men of the Citie, whereof he shall be Bishoppe, the holpe Gospell being set before them, shall take it vpon the verul of their soules, that they haue chosen them, neither for any gift, or reward, nor any promise or friendship, or any other cause: but knowing them to be of the right and catholike faith, and of honest lyfe, and to be learned, and to haue no wife, nor children, neyther concubine: but if any of them before had a wife, that he had but one, and the same y first, neyther a ydow, nor married to other husbande; nor otherwise forbidden by the lawes or holy constitutions: and that they know the person elected to be Bishop, to be no courtier, or officiall, or if he haue so bene, that he hath sith y time continued no lesse than tistene yeres in a monasterie, & that he is no lesse than fife and thirtie yeres olde: and if anye be ordained a Bishop, without the foresayde obseruations, we commaunde him by al meanes to be deposed, and depriued, from his Bishoprike: and he, y shall presume to ordaine any Bishop without the sayde obseruations, shall be suspended from his holy ministerie one yere, and his goods to be allotted to the Church wherof he is Bishop. And aboue al things he decreeth that it be obserued, that none be ordained Bishop, by mediation of Gold, Silver, or other thing, vpon payne of the depriuation, as well of the giuers, as of the receyuers, and mediatours of such symonie. This sarre is the verie summe and pitch of Iustianus hys Lawe concerning the election and ordayning of Bishoppes, worde for worde truely translated: though for tediousnesse I haue intermitted here and there things impertinent to this place. The which Lawe, were it this daye obserued, there shoulde

Neque curiale  
neque officia-  
lem esse.

Iubemus hunc  
omnibus mo-  
dis episcopatu  
depelli.

no such ambitious persons, barbers, vobers, courtiers, Rufflers, Symoniakes, ignorant Asses, Concubinarie, and other such vitious personnes, as doe nowe vsually aspire to the best Byshoprikes in the Romische court, epyther be admitted to Byshoprikes, or continue in the possession of them: neyther shoulde there epyther Pope or popish bishop be left in place. Touching Clerkes and priestes the law is this. We permit none to be ordeyned clerkes, vnlesse they be learned, and holde the right sayth, and be of honest lyfe, and neither haue had, nor haue a concubine, or naturall children, but liuing chastlye, or hauing a lawefull wife, and the same one, and the firste, neyther widdowe, nor diuorced from hir husbände, nor otherwyle forbydden by the lawes, and holy Canons.

Caste viuētes,  
aut vxorem  
legitimam, et  
ipsam voam, et  
primam ha-  
beres.

Diaconissan.

And we doe not permit a Priest to be made vnder thirtie & fīue yeares of age, neyther a Deacon or Subdeacon vnder fīue & twentie, nor a Reader vnder eigh- tene yeares: nor a Diaconisse (or widow to serue in the Church) vnder forty yeares old. One that is to be made a Deacon if he haue not a wife (as is aforesayde) already toynd to him, let him not be ordeyned, except he being asked befoze of him that doth ordeine him, doe promise that he can liue honestlie without a lawfull wyfe. And he that ordeyneth him, shall not be able in the tyme of the ordeyning, to permit to the Deacon, or Subdeacon, to take a wyfe after his ordination. And the Byshoppe who doth permit it, shall be put out of his Byshoprike. And if a Priest or a Deacon, or Subdeacon, after hys ordination doe marrie a wife, or haue a concubine, let him be put out of the cleargie. Thus farre touching the place by M. Dozman here alleaged, cōcerning priestes, Deacons, and other clerkes, & diaconisses, or wydowes,  
appointed

appointed to serue the Church, truely translated out of the same lawe of Iustinian. But of all these things *M. Dormā* could see nothing else, but only that which touched *ſ* celibate of ecclesiasticall ministers. And he thought that the intent & promise of a learned, honest, discrete and graue man, of the age of thirtie & fīue yeares, or vpwarde: or of an auncient woman, of the age of fortie yeares or more, touching not marrying, vpon the onely purpose more freely to serue God, will serue to the maintenaunce of their guileful inducing and intising, or violent inforcing of vndiscrete and vnksilfull yong men, and maydens, and almost boyes, and gyrls, into the sinnefull snares, of their pernicious popish bowes: or to the defence of the most false and faithlesse promises made by others of more age, but of little discretion and honestie, onely vppon hope of worldly rewardes and liking, and of an easie and ydle life, to be lead in a vitiousnesse, & vncleanlinesse, most manifestly knowen to the worlde, by the continuall practise, of most part of popish Notaries. And neither the ambition, corruptiō, bribery, symonie, lewd youth, courtlye life, keeping of concabines, nor any other mosse dishonest behauiour, most vsuall in the Romish cleargie, contrary to this lawe of Iustinian, & contrary to all mans and gods lawes, any thing moueth the mans minde: onely the hauing of a lawfull wife moueth *M. Dormans* conscience: though it be by Iustinian in this lawe confessed to be lawfull being also mosse agreable to Goddes lawe, and in the booke of Iustinians lawes, acknowledged to be better than to burne, as all the beaulye popish Notaries, for the mosse parte doe. And the Papiſts who doe alleage thys lawe, doe contrarpe to thys lawe of noyce ecclesiasticall persones from their wyues, and

*Vxorem legitimam habentes.*  
 1. Cor. 7 et  
 Authent col. 7.  
 tit. 2. in glōia.  
 Nubere est  
 consultus  
 quam vri.

also depriveth them from their livings: and in so many pointes breaking themselves, both this Lawe, and also Gods lawe, doe alleage one poynte thereof against suche ecclesiasticall ministers, whome the sayde Lawe toucheth nothing; as those who made no such promise, as in that Lawe is appointed, and doe therefore nothing against that Lawe: but doe mosse agreeable to Gods lawe, rather marry than so filthily to burne and live, as these popish Notaries doe.

Thus you may see good Readers, how many matters directly against the Papistes are contained in this bay place of Justinian, by M. Dorman here alleaged, al the which M. Dorman deeply dissembled, and for feare lest they might appeare, he durst not as much as note y<sup>e</sup> booke or place, where he had that, which he alleageth of bowes and celibate of ecclesiasticall ministers: & yet he talketh of places not coasted in y<sup>e</sup> Apologie. And as these Lawes ecclesiasticall made by Justinian the Emperour, do proue his chiefe auctoritie in matters, & over persons ecclesiasticall: so are there an huge number of lawes besides, that doe yet more effectually proue the same, as I shall hereafter declare. But I wil first say something to that partie popish shift, wherby M. Dorman trusteth to elude & frustrate all the Emperours auctoritie, in his lawes ecclesiasticall most evidently to all men declared.

*Dorman, fol. 48.*

But although this be true, that the Emperour Iustiniã not onely in these matters which touched the cleargie, but in many other also, hath entremedled: yet hath he alwayes so tempered the matter, as he hath showed him selfe to be a follower not a leader, & minister to execute, not a governer to prescribe. The which thing his owne words How Iustiniã in all suche places where he entreated of suche matters placed as it were for the nones, to take away al such sinister suspition, do manifestly

How Iustiniã  
made  
lawes in

scilicet

matters of  
the Church.

feſtly declare. For either he hath theſe words: Sequētes ea quæ ſacris definita ſunt canonibus: following the definition of the holy canons: or theſe, Sacras per omnia ſequētes regulas, in all points following the holy rules, or ſuch like: whereby he would have teſtified to the world, that he meant by his penall lawes, ſeverely to execute the canons of the Church, and nothing leſe than to make newe him ſelfe.

Nowell.

I would have the good Reader to knowe, frō whence this divinitie of *D. Dormans* doth come.

In the gloſe of *ſ* law by *Juſtinian* the Emperour made, concerning the eccleſiaſtical matters, which *D. Dormā* here ſpeaketh of, vpon the firſt word of the law *Sancim*?, we do decree, it is by ſome Lawier, no *Ciuitian* but mere Canonist, & the Popes owne ſwozne man, be you ſure, by theſe very words thus gloſed. Ad quid pro deo in-  
tromittit ſe Imperator de ſpiritualib<sup>9</sup> vel eccleſiaſticis, cū ſciat ad ſe nō pertinere. &c. Wherefore a Gods name doth the Emperour intermeddle in ſpiritual, or eccleſiaſtical maters, whē he knoweth they belong not to him? This is the mans ſummiſh queſtion: but he answered ſoberly thus. Reſpon. Dic, quod nō inueniēdo de nouo, vel conſtituendo ponit: ſed recitando ſacras regulas, contra quas ſi quis fecerit imponit pœnas: &c. vel, Dic q<sup>uod</sup> autoritate papæ facit, vel, Dic, hoc faciendo ſtatum reipub. tuetur: cū interſit reipub. eſſe ſacerdotes honeſtos, a qui-  
b<sup>9</sup> peccatorū poenitentia petamus &c. *ſ* is to ſay. The an-  
ſwere: ſay *ſ* he putteth theſe, not inuening the a new, or decreeing and ordaining, but rehearſing *ſ* holy rules, againſt the which if a man do, he layeth penalties vpon them. Or elſe ſay: *ſ* he doth it by the authoritie of the Pope, or elſe ſay: *ſ* the Emperour in ſo doing, doth de-  
ſend & maintaine the ſtate of the cōmon wealch: for it

Authent. col. 1  
tit. 6 quomo-  
do oportet e-  
piſcopos.

Pro Deo. It  
was happy he  
layd not Pro  
Diabolo, for  
he was very  
angry.

Here be two  
Dicks and but  
one Richard.

Ponit.

Vel dic quod  
autoritate pa-  
pæ facit. This  
Dic is Sureſby.  
This is Richard

Is for the common wealth y<sup>e</sup> Priests should be honest, of whome we may aske penance of our sinnes. Thus saith this Canonist in his glose, out of the whiche *Q. Doorman* had his diuinitie which he sheweth in this answer, translate almost worde for worde out of the saide glose: so that his law stode him here in good stode. But *Q. Doorman* hath omitted the last of these thre answeres, which is most worthy the noting: that Priests can not well be kept in honest behauiour, but by y<sup>e</sup> seuerer lawes of godly Princes. And if such lawes of godly Princes were profitable therfore in *Justinian* his tyme, they are nowe in this outragious dissolutenesse of our Popishe *Notaries*, surely more than necessary. And whereas this gloser *Q. Doorman*'s authour, hath called so many dikes, lusty lads together, only to remoue out of the way this blocke of one *Sancimus*, we doe decree, bled by *Justinian*, you may well vnderstand how it grieueth the *Papistes* to see so many *Sancim<sup>o</sup>*, *ordinamus*, *decernim<sup>o</sup>*, *cōstitutimus*, *definimus*, *volumus*, *precipim<sup>o</sup>*, *mandam<sup>o</sup>*, *iubem<sup>o</sup>*, & *rursū*, *interdicimus*, *prohibemus*, *nō permittim<sup>o</sup>*. &c. that is to say: we decree, ordaine, decerne, constitute, determine, define, we wil, we commaund, we charge: and againe, we forbid them, we do not permit or suffer them: with other termes or wordes of like effect continually bled by *Justinian* the Emperour in his so many lawes, made to binde al estates of the Church, as *Patriarkes*, *Archbishops*, *Bishops*, *Rulers* of *Monasteries*, *Hōkes*, and al other gouernours of the cleargie, & amongst them the *B.* of *Rome* him selfe by name. Surely it appeareth that *Pope John* of *Rome*, who liued at that time, was not so offered as was this canonist, with the Emperour: the which *Pope* in an epistle to the sayd Emperour witten, doth much praise the Emperour as most godly, wise,

and

Dic. vel dic, vel  
dic.

Cod. i. epistola  
Inter claras.

and well doing the duety of a Godly Christian prince, specially, for that he toke great care of Religion and of Church matters, and was the authour of the peace & vntitie of the Church, & made lawes for the remouing of heretiques. &c. as in the sayd Pope Johns epistle plainly appeareth: whereby you may vnderstande, that the sitters in that holy see, haue in processe of time chainged their minde. Nowe it is very ridiculous, y<sup>e</sup> *Dormā* who of this one worde placuit, *it pleasech vs*, once vsed by bishops, maketh such a matter for their auzhoritie ouer Princes & ciuill Magistrates, notwithstanding that all words & termes of auzhoritie possible to be vsed, are by Iustinian vsed in his lawes, yet sayth that Iustinian showed him selfe a follower not a leader, a minister to execute, not a gouerner to prescribe. And though I might safely leaue it to the discrete readers iudgement, whether these words of y<sup>e</sup> Emperour, we decree, we ordaine, we define, we wil, and commaund, permit or suffer, we do not suffer, we forbid with other like, vsed to patriarkes, archbishops, bishops, & al gouernours in y<sup>e</sup> cleargie, yea to the B. of Rome him self, be y<sup>e</sup> words of a follower, & minister, as *Dormā* saith, or of a leader, & gouerner: yet for the meancr reader his more full instructiō and satisfaction, I will here rehearse a forme or twaine of lawes made to binde the chiefs and highest Prelates of the Church.

Iustinian the Emperour going about to brydle the auarice & excessiue taking of sumes of mony, vsed by the Prelates in the ordenyng of bishops, & other ecclesiasticall ministers, maketh this law. Iubemus beatiss. archiepiscopos, patriarchas, hoc est, senioris Romæ, Cōstantinopoleos, et Alexādris, et Theopoleos et Hierosolomorū. &c. that is to say, we do commaund the most blessed archbishops, & patriarkes, y<sup>e</sup> is the patriark of the elder Rome, and of Constantinople, & of Alexandria, & of Antiochia,

and

Dor. fol. 45. & supra. fol. 275.

Sancimus, ordiuamus, decernim<sup>9</sup> constatuimus, definim<sup>9</sup>, volum<sup>9</sup>, præcipimus, mandamus, iubemus: et contra, Interdicimus, prohibemus, non permittimus. &c.

Authent. co. 9. tit. 15. de sanctiss. Episcopis col. 718. Theopol. 1. Antiochiæ. The Pope commaunded by the Emperour,

and of Hierusalem, that if their custome be no lesse than twentie pounde in golde to be giuen in the ordpning of Bpshops, and Clerkes, that so much be onely giuen as the custome is, but that no moze be giuen a boue. xx. pound in golde, and so forth. Here is the beginning of an ecclesiasticall law, made by the Emperour Iustinā, to binde y Pope or Bpshop of Rome & al other Patriarkes: and the Emperour vseth as well to the B. of Rome, as to the other Patriarkes, this worde lubemus, we do cōmaund you. And yet sayth god M. Dozmā the Emperour intermedleth in causes Ecclesiasticall, as a folower, not a leader: as a minister not a gouernour. And in this procelle of that long lawe he vseth often the words permissimus, nō permissimus, interdicimus, &c. we suffer you to doe this, this we suffer you not to doe, but doe forbid it you. &c. And he breaketh their ecclesiasticall customes, if they tended to excessiue taking, and he binde th them to a certeine summe in al their ordinations of bps: and appointeth a penaltie to the transgressours of hys lawe, at his will & pleasure, as in the sayd law at large appeareth: which is not the doing of a folower, & minister as M. Dozman sayth, but of a leader & gouernour. And it is most false, that M. Dozman sayth: that Iustinā made no new lawes: but executed the old canōs only. For in this one lawe there are very many pointes which M. Dozmā nor any other cā shew in any former canō, or cōstitutio. The same Iustinā in an other ecclesiasticall law speaketh thus. Definimus vt nemo deo amabiliū episcoporū foris à sua ecclesia plus q̄ per totū annū deesse. audeat: nisi hoc per imperialē fiat iussionem: tunc (enim solū erit incalpabile) sacratissimos patriarchas vniuscuiusque dioeceseos cōpellentes, deo amabiles Episcopos suis inharere sanctis. ecclesijs. that is to say: we do de fine that none of the Bishoppes of God beloued, be so bolde, as to  
be

Authentic. col. i  
tit. 6. Quomo-  
do oporteat  
episcopos.

be absent from their Church more than one yeare, but  
 lesse it be done by the Emperours commaundemēt (for  
 then onely it shall be blamelesse,) compelling the mosse  
 holy Patriarkes of every diocesse, to cause the Bishops  
 of God beloued, to remaine vpon their Churches. &c.  
 Thus farre Iustinian. And I would that *M. Doorman*,  
 who made vs before such a do, of the Bishops subscribing de-  
 finiens subscripsi, I defining haue subscribed: and of their  
 saying, placet, it pleaseth vs, woulde note this the Empe-  
 rours defining, commaunding, licensing, forbidding: for  
 this same lawe is in an other place penned, by þ̄ woꝛde  
 interdicimus, we forbid the bishops, &c. the which Empe-  
 rour also setteth a penaltie in the same lawe vpon such  
 Bishops, as shall transgresse the sayde lawe & amongst  
 other penalties, depꝛiuatiō also. And in an other eccle-  
 siasticall lawe, he hath these woꝛdes. Iubem⁹ vnumquē-  
 que beatū archiepiscopū, & Patriarcham, & metropoli-  
 tā, factis. Episcopos, &c. that is: we commaund every one  
 of the blessed Archbishops, Patriarks, & Metropolitans,  
 once or twise every yeare, to cal together the most holy  
 Bishops being vnder them, and diligently to examine  
 all causes. &c. In the which lawes this is to be noted a-  
 mongst other notable things: that mentiō is made that  
 the Patriarkes of Rome, Cōstātinople, Alexandria, &c.  
 haue every one of them seuerall diocesses, or patriarke-  
 ships, & iurisdictions: which diuisiō was made by order,  
 taken in the first Councils. Whereby the false claime  
 that the Bishop of Rome maketh to an vniuersall au-  
 thoꝛitie ouer the whole Church, and that also by Gods  
 lawe, and Godwill, is most manifest.

Againe the same Iustinian in an other lawe speaketh  
 thus. Interdicim⁹ factis. episcopis: we do forbid þ̄ most  
 holy bishops, pꝛiestes, deacons, subdeacons, to play at the  
 tables,

Dormā fol. 44  
 & supra. 250.  
 &c.

Authent. col. 9  
 tit. 15. de sanc-  
 tific. episcopis.

Authent. col. 9  
 tit. 15. de sanc-  
 tific. episcopis.

Authent. col. 9  
 tit. 15. de sanc-  
 tific. episcopis.  
 Ad tabulas  
 ludere.

tables, or to take parte with, or loke vpon them y<sup>e</sup> play :  
 or to loke vpon any kinde of spectacles, or games : and if  
 any doe offende herein, we commaund him to be suspen-  
 ded from the venerable ministerie for thre yeares, &c.  
 After this sort and forme, are there a great multitude  
 of ecclesiastical lawes, made by Iustinian : which I am  
 sure no man of reason, will iudge to be done as by a fo-  
 llower, and minister (as *D. Dormā* sayth) but rather, as  
 by a leader and gouernour. But with *D. Dormā* not  
 long befoze, one seely worde placuit, *it pleased vs*, when  
 it was by the waye spoken by certaine Bishops, was a  
 worde of maruellous force and auctoritie, and the men  
 might haue chose whether they would or no, like *Lezde* :  
 but Emperours in their lawes continually to will, to  
 commaunde, to charge Archbishops, Patriarkes, Me-  
 tropolitanes, yea, and the Bishop of Rome by name,  
 as well as others, to doe this, to forbid them, that they  
 dare not be so bolde as to doe that, without the Empe-  
 rours leaue, or cōmaundement, and to define, assigne, &  
 apoint penalties vnto them, in case they shal doe other-  
 wise, all this is with *D. Dormā* the forme and phrase  
 of a follower not of a leader, of a minister not of a gouernour, to pre-  
 scribe : for with *D. Dormā* euery tryling worde ser-  
 ueth for the auctoritie of Bishops, but al words can not  
 serue princes auctoritie, but were there no other presi-  
 dents nor proufes, sauing only Iustinians lawes, they a-  
 lone are abundantly sufficiēt, to proue y<sup>e</sup> chief auctoritie  
 of christiā princes ouer persons, & in causes ecclesiastical.  
 And had not *D. Dormā* rather be a popish canonist, thā  
 a right ciuiliane, he could not but graunt the same.

Now touching *D. Dormā*s qualification & temper-  
 ring of this matter by these wordes, somewhere used  
 by the Emperour Iustinian. *Sequentes sacras regulas :  
 sequentes*

*Dormā* fol. 45  
 & supra. 255.  
 &c.

sequentes ea, &c. following the holy rules, following the things defined by the holy canons. Truth it is, that he somewhere useth these wordes: but that he doeth so in all places where he maketh constitutions of ecclesiastical matters, as *D. Dozman* sayth, is most vntrue.

Now where *D. Dozman* would haue *h* simple to think that by these wordes the holy rules, the holy canons, the Popes decrees & decretals, or his Romish constitutions were ment, and that Christian Emperours, & princes, might do no other thing, than is by him in them determined & appointed: I haue thought it expediēt to make it plaine, what is truely ment by these wordes. *Justinian* the Emperour in his Authentiques speaketh thus. Sancim<sup>9</sup> igitur sacras per omnia sequentes regulas dū quispiam ad ordinationem episcopatus adducitur, considerari prius eius vitam secundum sanctū apostolum, si honesta et inculpabilis, & vndique irreprehensibilis sit. &c. that is to say. We following in al points the holy rules, doe ordaine or decree, that when any is brought to be ordained a bishop, *h* his life be first (according to the holy Apostle *S. Paule*) considered, whether it be honest and inculpable, and euery where irreprehensible: and so forth as is contayned in *S. Paules* first epistle to *Timothie*. Here it is moste manifest, that *Justinian* calleth the holy Scriptures sacras Regulas, the holpe rules, that he followed in al points. And *h* glose there reckoneth out foure points to a bishop appertaining by the holy rules, which *Justinian* here speaketh of, which are al conteyned in the.ij. chapter of *S. Paules* first epistle to *Timothie*. Whereby also it is manifest, *h* the holy scriptures & word of God are here ment by the holy rules, which *Justinian* in al points followed in his ecclesiastical lawes making. And in *h* same title yet more plainly he saith thus. Hac

Col. 1. tit. 6.  
quomodo oporteat episcopos.

1. Timoth. 3.

autē de deo amabilibus episcopis, secundū diuinas constituentes regulas, et religiosos clericos cū multa fieri inquisitione secundū diuinas regulas sancimus. &c. that is to say: we hauing ordayned these things, concerning Bishops beloued of God according to the diuine rules, doe also decreē that the religious clearkes be made with great inquisitiō or triall, according to the diuine rules. Thus far Iustiniā. Loe here you may see that the rules which he befoze called sanctas or sacras, holy rules, here he calleth diuinas regulas the diuine rules, so that there can no doubt remaine, but that Iustiniā the Emperour by the holy & diuine rules, meaneth the holy scriptures, but no words are moze plaine thā these: Bene autē uersa geruntur et cōpetenter, si rei principium fiat decens et amabile deo. Hoc autē futuriū esse credimus, si sacrarū regularū obseruatio custodiatur, quā iusti et laudandi et adorandi inspectores et ministri dei uerbi tradiderunt Apōstoli, et sancti pātres custodierunt, et explanauerunt. &c. that is to say: Al things are wel done & conueniently, if such a beghining as is comely, & pleasaunt to God, be made. And we do beleue y this wil be done, if that the holy rules be kept: the which holy rules the iust, and praise woorthy, & honorable ouersers, and ministers of the woꝛde of God the Apōstles deliuered, & the holy fathers haue kept & explained. Thus far Iustinian: whereby it is euident y by the holy rules he meaneth the holye scriptures witten by the Apōstles, and that the fathers ought to be keepers and expounders thereof. But the Pope hath made decrees contrarie to these holy rules: yea he hath altered & utterly abolished many of y old canons, as wel those, which are called of y Apōstles, as other most auncient canons, & hath made other most contrary to them: and yet requireth this canon

non breaker of vs, the keeping of the canons, & Godwil. Now whereas Iustinian by his lawes, commaundeth a Bishop or Priest, who is ordained, contrarie to the sayd holy lawes of the scriptures, or being lawfully ordained, behaueh him selfe contrarie to the same, to be deposed, and depriued of his Bishoprike: it pleaseth vs right well, that M. Dozman allotweth, that Christian Princes may doe the lyke to Popishe Bishoppes, so that the Princes therein follow the holpe rules of the Scriptures, forbidding any to be a Bishoppe or Priest, that is not learned, not discrete, sober, chaste, harberous and without blame of lyfe, & that vnlearned and ydle asses, quarellers, dzonkardes, fighters, filthye whozomongers, concubinaries, and wicked Idolaters, be not suffered by christian Princes to remaine in Bishoprikes, or in the cleargie, which if it be obserued, we shall haue a good riddance of a great rable of Popishe shauelings shortly. Further, whereas euery edict, rescript, proclamation, or Lawe of the Emperour was in those dates by a peculiar terme called *sacra*, the Emperours holy wot: if M. Dozman wil haue any thing, besides the sacred scriptures, ment by these wordes *sacras regulas* holy rules, what letteth, but y the Emperour may meane the former constitutions ecclesiastical of auncient Emperours his predecessours, which are peculiarly called *sacra*, & the which he also gathered together into his boke: But in case M. Dozman, will needes drato the words bled by Iustinian the Emperour, *we following things defined by holy canons to constitutions*, and ordinaunces made in auncient counceles, it so little hindereth vs, y it maketh altogether with vs, for those holy canons, that he speaketh of, had their confirmation, and authoritie by Christian Princes, as I haue befoze declared

Sacra

A REPROVVE OF M.

particularlie in certayne counsels: and therefore the authoritie of the Emperour in ecclesiasticall matters is thereby confirmed, not hindered.

Whoeuer those constitutions be suche holpe canons, as were made before Iustinian his tyme: insomuch that of these men doe boldly break, who so earnestly call by on vs, for the keeping of their canons, neyther holy nor auncient, but new diuelish deuises made for the maintenance of their owne wickednesse, & superstition, contrarie, both to the holy rules of the Scriptures which Iustinian speaketh of, and contrarie to the auncient canons made in the olde counsels: and contrarie to all Iustinian his constitutions, & lawes, with one little byaunche whereof yet thought nothing to vs appertayning, this Popishe canonist chargeth vs: passing ouer in y meane season, with dissembling eyes, the corruptions, libertes, and symonies, the whozedomes, concubitates, and most filthy life, the ignoraunce, ydelnesse, wicked playes, and pastimes, the vsurpation of temperal dominion and iurisdiction, with a thousand moe abominations, in the Romishe court and cleargie most vsuall and ordinarie.

*Dorman. fol. 48.*

In this sense vsed be the word Sancimus, we ordaine: Where speaking of the first foure generall counsels and the B. of Rome, he hath these words: Sancim<sup>9</sup> vt secundū corū definitiones sanctissimus veteris Romæ papa, primus omnium sacerdotū sit. We ordaine according to their definition (the first foure generall counsels) that the most holy Pope of olde Rome, be the chiefe Priest.

*Nowell.*

This is word for word borrowed out of his maister D. Harding his first booke: but like a wise man where his maister

*Costit. 132.*  
The firste  
fower gene-  
ral coun-  
cels defined  
the popes  
superioritie,  
nor Phocas  
as the pro-  
testants ma-  
liciously as-  
sirme.

maister put Iustinian and Phocas both in the terte,  
 M. Dozman hath remoned Phocas into the margent  
 of his booke, else all is one euerye worde, touching  
 Iustinian and Phocas toynthly. He that list see this  
 matter fully answered maye resoꝛte to the Bishoppe of  
 Sarisbarie his repleve to D. Harding, where he shall  
 finde both thys obiection, and the aunswere to it. Now  
 I doe thinke that M. Dozman here referring the definition  
 of the Popes superioritic, vnto the foure first generall counceils, shall  
 mislike & Popes holinesse, (get he intelligence thereof,)  
 foꝛ that he nowe, vpon better aduise, wyll needs haue  
 it to be defined by the holye Scriptures: feareng lest if  
 it shoulde come to light, that his auzhoritie were defi-  
 ned by mans auzhoritie, it might be fined and ended  
 also againe by the same. And in dede it is without all  
 controuersie, that the first generall counceils, foꝛ god  
 oꝛder sake and quietnesse, oꝛdeined certaine sees to be  
 pꝛimacies, patriarchall, oꝛ pꝛincipall sees: the Bishopps  
 wherof shoulde be the chiefe, and aboue al other Bishopps  
 within the pꝛecinct, compasse, & iurisdiction of the pro-  
 uinces, to them assigned. And after that Costantinople  
 warded great & equal with olde Rome, the Bishop of that  
 see was oꝛdeyned, and made the secunde Patriarke.  
 Nowe thonghe these Patriarkes were all of equall  
 auzhoritie, yet foꝛ auoyding of strife in assembles,  
 and meetings at Synodes and Counceils, euerye one  
 of them had hys place in oꝛder assigned him. And  
 foꝛ that olde Rome (as it is in the Chalcedonense coun-  
 cell declared) was the auzcient seate of the Emperie,  
 the Bishoppe of that see was oꝛdeyned to be in oꝛder  
 the first pꝛimate, oꝛ Patriarke: the Bishop of Constan-  
 tinople because it was newe Rome, the nexte: the By-  
 shop of Alexandria, the thirde: the Bishop of Anciochia,  
 the

In the .8. diu-  
 sion pag. 241.

242.

Council. Con-  
 stantinop. 1. et  
 Chalcedon.  
 Act. 16.

Act. 16.

Tom. 1. Cōcil.  
de accusatione  
Polychronij  
Hierosolymiti-  
tani. pag. 608.

the fourth : and the Bishop of Hierusalem, by the rising and flourishing of Constantinople, the fift ; and in dede such order was necessarie to be taken, for both the Bishops of Hierusalem first, and afterwarde the Bishops of Constantinople did striue for the first place. Now that the greatnesse and flourishing of the Cityes was the cause of this order, and not the holynesse or worthynesse of the firste Bishops, that satte in those Sees (as the Popes falsely clayme by Saint Peter) is most euident hereby, that Antiochia where Peter was firste, goeth behinde Alexandria, where Marke was firste : and Hierusalem the mosse holy Cite, where James was first, and also both Alexandria, and Antiochia, goe behinde Constantinople, of late befoze being but a meane, and poore Cite, onely for that it was by the presence of the Emperours (who after Constantinus Magnus made their most residence there) growen to be most great and flourishing.

Nowe the Emperour Justinian according to this order taken in the olde councelles, doth ordaine that the Pope or Bishop (for all is one) of olde Rome, according to the definitions of the Canons, shoulde be the foremost or chiefe of all Priestes : That is to saye, the firste in order of the Primates or Patriarkes. For it is plaine by all Justinians lawes Ecclesiasticall, where he speaketh of thys matter, as I haue partely befoze declared, that Justinian the Emperour meante of no other chieftie : for he assigneth euerie Patriarke his owne Diocesse or Primacie senerallye. But these Popishe Sophisters would reason bypon Justinians wordes, that their Pope shoulde be heade and gouernoz of all other Primates or Patriarkes, and byshops, and of the whole Church of Christ in earth : which is as reasonable gathered, as if that

Authent. col. 1  
Tit. 6. Quo-  
modo oportet  
episcopos.

It were agreed that the frenche king in order and dignitie should be the first of all other Christian Kinges, one would thereof gather, that the Frenche king were the head and chiefe governour of all other Christian Kinges, and whole Christendome. But the Emperour him selfe though in deede in dignitie the first and chiefe of Christian Princes, doth yet claime no interest at all in other Christian kingdomes, whiche owe him no fealtie, muche lesse doth he claime the chiefe headshippe, and gouernaunce ouer them, and their kingdomes.

This ambition therefore toucheth no Christian Princes, but is reserued for the Romish Antichrist, the Prince of this woordes generall Vicar, and Balliffe exarant here in earth.

*Dorman. Fol. 49.*

*Smallie howe in all like matters Iustinian is to be vnderstande, if nothing elles, his epistle written to Iohannes then B. of Rome is able sufficient by to enstruct vs. VVhere he most manifestlie protesteth, to suffer nothing that apperteineth to the estate of the church, to passe, yea although the truthe thereof be perspicuouse and out of all doubt, without the bringing thereof first to the knowledge of his holinesse, and he addeth for a reason quia caput est omnium sanctorum ecclesiarum, because he is the head of all the holic Churches that be.*

*No well.*

The Pope  
cōfessed by  
Iustinia the  
Emperour  
to be the  
head of all  
Churches,

The Epistola Inter claras, which you here alleage, with y matier therabout by you noted, is not so clara as you wold make it. For as Azo, & Greg. Valoander, doe tellie it is not to be seene at all in diuers bookes. And whosoever marketh Iustinians Lawes, continually

Cod. li. x. De Ma-  
ma Trinit, in  
glosa.

proceedinge in lawlike forme, & with lawlike termes, Sancimus, decernimus, definimus, iubemus, &c. we decree, we ordeine, we define, we comaunde: & withall, wel considereth that epistle of John y Bishop of Rome, wherin he most miserablie both pleadeth, & beggeth for the authoritie of his Romish see: and how y said epistle is deuided into tow partes, & how the Emperours letter is inclosed in the middle of the Popes letters, one part of the Popes letters going befoze y Emperour his letter, & the residue going behinde, he may haue iust occasions much to muse, how that long epistle of the Popes, & discourse about his see, should escape in emogst Iustintians his lawes, & may probablite consecreture it to be thrust in by some Papist, to thend that in y title of the most high Trinitie, and the catholike faith, there might be some thing placed, that sounded for the Popes supzernacie, y it might also be take for an article of y catholike faith, and wozythy to be set next the treatie of the most blessed Trinitie: wheras in deede that epistle of Pope John it is moze mete, & wozythy to be placed emongst the Popes extrauagantes, than in Iustintians lawes. And wheras you do alleage first, *that the Emperour protesteth that he would suffer nothing apperteyning to the estate of the church to passe, without the bring ing therof first to the Bishoppe of Romes knowlege:* sure the Emperour did wel, to let such learned men (as were communely the Bishops of Rome at those daies) bring the Bishoppes also of the first and chiefe see, be of knowlege of suche matters Ecclesiasticall, as he would him selfe passe in forme of Lawe. So will all wise and good Princes, let suche matters as they do intend to make proclamations or lawes of, come to the knowlege of their counsell befoze they passe them: but what ma-  
 keth

Ad notitiã vestre  
 Sanctitatis, &  
 inorescar vestre  
 Sanctitati.

heth that for your purpose *M. Dorman*, or against vs: The Emperour Constantine might haue vsed the like woordes to Hosius Cordubensis: Valentinianus, and Theodosius the Emperours might haue vsed the like to S. Ambrose: any godlie Emperour may vse the like to any notable learned Bishop, *that he would not suffer any Ecclesiasticall matier to passe without his knowlege.* But knowlege to consider & geue councel, & authoritie to determine and make lawes, are not all one. But you will saye the pith of the matier foloweth in the cause why Iustinian wold so referre all matters Ecclesiasticall, to the Bishop of Rome: which you alleage thus. *Quia caput est omniū ecclesiarum, because he is the head of all the holie churches that be.* These woordes are not so in my booke *M. Dorman*, neither in any ould, or nue print, y<sup>e</sup> I can find, but thus. *Quæ caput est omniū sanctarū ecclesiarum: y<sup>e</sup> whiche is the head of all holie churches.* And in the glose also it is expounded thus. *Quæ Romana ecclesia, the whiche Romane church is the head of all churches.* Thus is y<sup>e</sup> text: thus is the glose. But this gloser *M. Dormā*, as a man now vpon his own ground, & law, bringeth vs frō the church to be head, *to the Pope to be head,* & therupon also maketh his marginal note thus. *The Pope confessed by Iustinian the Emperour, to be the head of all churches.* No sir, not soe confessed by Iustinian the Emperour, but by *M. Dorman* the glosar. And so farre of is it, that Iustinian the Emperour doeth confesse it, that your Pope John dare not chalenge it to him-selfe, but to his see or church, in the same epistola inter claras, by you here alleaged, by these very woordes. *Romanæ sedis reuerentiam obseruatis, & ei cuncta subiectis &c. quæ esse oim vere ecclesiarū caput, & patrum regulæ, & principum statuta declarant &c.* that is to say: you (saith Pope John to Iustinian) do obserue

Cod. li. r. De s<sup>ta</sup>-  
ma Trinit, tit. 6.

Quam esse, not  
quem esse, as M.  
Dorman would  
haue it;

the reuerence of the Romane see, & do bying al thinges  
in subiection to it: the whiche ( see oꝝ Church ) both the  
rulers of the fathers, & the statutes of Princes do de-  
clare to be verelie the head of all Churches. Thus farre  
are the Bishop of Romes woꝝdes. Whereby you may  
see M. Dorman, that it is neither confessed by the Em-  
perour Iustinian, noꝝ yet chalenged by the Pope him  
selfe, that the Pope should be the head of all Churches,  
but y<sup>e</sup> the Church of Rome should be the head. And this  
Pope John being not so well learned ( that is, not so  
well practised in falshood ) as are our holie fathers now,  
maketh his chalenge foꝝ the headship of his Church,  
not by the authoritie of y<sup>e</sup> Scriptures ( as do false Popes  
& Papiſtes now a daies ) but by the rules of the fathers,  
and statutes of Princes. And you herein as a Lawter,  
haue well folowed the Lawe, leauing the Scriptures,  
and going about to proue your Pope head of all chur-  
ches by Iustiniāns Lawes, by you foꝝ that purpose fal-  
sified. The whiche Pope, by the statutes of Princes,  
should most iustly lose the authoritie, by the statutes of  
Princes to him graunted, foꝝ the vniust abuse of the  
same, contrarie to the said statutes of Princes: and foꝝ  
claiming, and falsely vsurping muche moze than euer  
was graunted oꝝ geuen him. But you will ( I thinke )  
reple. If the Emperour Iustinia did cōfesse the church  
of Rome to be head of all Churches: Ergo withall, he  
confessed the Pope of Rome to be head of all Churches.  
Whiche is like, as if one would say: Because London  
is the head of all the cities in Englande: therefore the  
Mayor of London is head of all the cities in Englande,  
and both may be well your reasons M. Dorman.

Now that the Church of Rome ( foꝝ that the citie  
of Rome

of Rome was the seate of the Empire, and so the head  
 citie of all other) might also be called the head of all  
 Churches, that is the chiefe Church, by a certen phrase,  
 vsed by Iustinian, we will not greatly denie: but who  
 soeuer seeth the same phrase and very woordes vsed in  
 Pope Johns epistle, may wel thinke that they were by  
 some Popishe artificer thrust into Iustinian the Em-  
 perour his epistle also. But be it, Iustinian called the  
 Church of Rome head of all Churches, what proueth  
 that phrase any moze for that vniuersall rule and au-  
 thoritie of the Pope ouer all Churches, whiche he nowe  
 claimeth, than this phrase which I spake of befoze: Lon-  
 don is the head of all citie in England, proueth that  
 Londō, or y<sup>e</sup> Paloz thereof, hath an vniuersall power &  
 authoritie ouer all the citie of England? But of suche  
 phrases as these, the Popishe Sophisters make many  
 captious clenches, and perelous paralogismes.

Now, that Iustinian the Emperour ment not that  
 either the Bishop or Church of Rome should haue any  
 headshyp ouer other Churches, otherwise than to be the  
 first Bishop, and Church in ordze and place, is euidēt  
 by Iustinian the Emperour him selfe, who deuiddeth the  
 Patriarkes and their diocesses (for so the Emperour in  
 his Lawes termeth them) or their Patriarchates (as  
 the glose there termeth them) severally: and doeth by  
 name severally geue commaundement and charge to  
 the said Patriarkes, the Bishop of Rome, as well as  
 the other Patriarches, euerie one of the to looke to the  
 lausfull ordzining of Bishoppes vnder their severall iur-  
 isdiction, accozdinge to the saide Emperours lawes:  
 whiche both openeth the matter of their severall iurisdic-  
 tions, and that therefore the Bishoppe of Rome had  
 not an

Authent. col. 1.

Tit. 6. Pag. 75.

patriarchas vni-  
 uscuusque dia-  
 cessoos.

In glosa. id est,

Patriarchatus.

not an vniuersall iurisdiction ouer all churches, or the whole church: and also that the Emperour Iustinian was the Bishop of Romes superiour.

Cod. De sacro-  
sanctis ecclesijs  
omni inuoca-  
tione.

Authent. vt de-  
terminatus sit  
numerus Cleri-  
corum.

Nouel. Cōst. 83.

Cod. De sacro-  
sanctis ecclesijs.  
Decernimus.

Et Nicephori  
lib. 7. cap. 28.

1. Pea the same Emperour Iustinian in his lawes declareth that the church of the citie of Constantinople, enjoyeth the same prerogatiue that the church of the elder Rome doeth enjoye, and he nameth the Patriarke of Constantinople vniuersal Patriarke, which both doe quite ouerthrowe your Popes supzernacie, and vniuersall power ouer the whole church.

2. Iustinian the Emperour ordeined or decreed that the see of Iustiniana prima in the prouinces subiect to it, should haue the place that the Apostolike see of Rome had in the prouinces vnder it, and as Nicephorus saith that it should be head to it selfe, with full power. The like he did of the see of Iustiniana secunda, which also cleane ouerthroweth that supzernacie of the Bishop of Rome, and vniuersall power ouer the whole church nowe by the Papistes surmised.

These are sufficient witnesses, that Iustinian the Emperour neuer ment, that your Romishe Pope nor church should haue any chiefe or headshippe ouer all churches, as is nowe by that vsurper claimed: and that the Bishop of Rome to be the chiefe of all Priestes, and the church of Rome to be the head of all churches, is with Iustinian nothing elles, but to haue the chiefe or first place in order, and not to haue an vniuersal rule or power ouer all Bishops, and Churches, as is nowe falsely claimed by that vsurper.

Authent. col. 1.  
tit. 6. Quomo-  
do oporteat e-  
piscopo.

3. I may also adde here, that Iustinian the Emperour declareth in his lawes, that the Pope hath no temporall iurisdiction of the Empire, and that he ought not to intermedle in Tempozall matiers. Thus muche concerne

concerning Iustinians lawes touching the Pope.

- Euag. li. 4. cap. 38. 4. Now Iustinian the Emperour, assembled the Bishops to the councell at Constantnople, called the fifth generall council, and governeth the council. In which councell not the Bishop of Rome, but Menas, the Patriarke of Constantinople was president.
- Nicep. li. 17. cap. 27. & Concil. 5. Act. 1. &c. 5. He confirmeth the decree of the councell.
- Concil. 5. Act. 1. fa. 61. 62. 63. 5. Paulus Bishop of Apamæa with manie other Bishops & men of the Cleargie, doe acknowledge the Emperour his chiefe authoritie in Ecclesiasticall matters.
- Act. 1. In libellis Pauli episcopi Apamæarum & monachorum secundæ Syriæ. &c. Tom. 2. 6. And Menas the Patriarke and president of the councill, doth expressly declare befoze the whole council, that no controversies moved in the holie Church ought to be determined without the Emperour his minde and commaundement.
- Côcil. fa. 21. 22. 23. &c. & Act. 4. fa. 87. col 2. Nihil eorū quæ in sanctis. ecclesia mouentur, conuenit fieri præter opinionem & iussum ipsius Imperatoris.
- And as Iustinian the Emperour made lawes touching the Primates, and Patriarches, and amongst them the Bishop of Rome: so made he lawes concerning other Ecclesiasticall persons and matters.
- Novellarū. 7. As touching the number of the Cleargie, that it shal be certen, & according to the reuenues of euery church.
- Const. 3. No. 681. 16. 8. Concerning remouing of Clerkes frō one Church to an other, for suppliyng of defectes.
- No. 681. 83. 9. Concerning the correction of Clerkes.
- No. 681. 6. 10. Concerning the ordeining of Bishops, & the charges of the same.
- No. 681. 17. 11. Concerning seruice of the Church, & it be not done in private houses.

12. Concerning exequies and seruises about the dead, & repressing of the insatiable auarice & bzyberie of pziestes than beginning to growe great.  
 Constit. 59.
13. Concerning pziuileges of Churches.  
 Const. 131.
14. Concerninge residences of Bishoppes, and other Ecclesiasticall ministers.  
 Const. 58.
15. The Emperour Iustinian as did befoze him Constātinus, and Iustinus, and after him Mauritiuſ Emperours, ordeined certen holidays to be kept, and he made Psalmes, and cōmaunded them to be song in churches: whiche was obserued afterward as an inuolable law.  
 Nicepho. lib. 17. cap. 28.
16. Concerning Monasteries, Monkes and their gouernours he maketh lawes, euidently declaring his chiefe authozitie ouer those persons also, who now by Popish pziuileges are exempt from all subiectiō to Pzioces.  
 Nouel. const. 5. 79. & Const. 133.
17. And he did not onelie make Ecclesiasticall lawes him selfe, but also hath gathered together a great number of Ecclesiasticall Lawes, made by his pziecessours godly Emperours, Constantinus, Valentinianus, Gratianus, Archadius, Honorius, and Martianus, to be scene in the Cod. too long here to be reherſed. Whiche lawes of Iustinian, and those other godlie Emperours, who so euer will peruse & wel consider, shal neuer after doubt, but that Christian Emperours, frō Constantinus Paganus, the first Christian Emperour knowen, vnto this Iustinianus the Emperour his time, by the space of a boue towe hundzeth yeeres, in that part of the pziimate Churche (which in comparison to the most cozrupt Romishe Synagoge that nowe is, was most pure) had the chiefe authozitie ouer persons, and in matters Ecclesiasticall: howsoeuer these wilde Romishe fores haue creapt out of their earthes, into the possētiō of the Bīōs  
 right,

eight, now in these later corrupt and blinde dales.

And I thinke that the multitude of Lawes Ecclesiasticall made by Christian Princes, being to *Dr. Dorman* as a great Lawier, not vnknowe, caused him that whan he had once in his diuision of Iurisdiction Ecclesiasticall made mention of *authoritie in makinge rules and lawes, for the gouernement of the Church*, he durst neuer after speake of it againe, but passed it ouer in silence in this whole treatie of Iurisdiction Ecclesiasticall, as though it were no part thereof, and as though he had nothing to do therewith.

Sup. fol. 18. 2.

Dorman. Fol. 49.

To conclude therefore, touching the examples brought from the doinges of the Emperour Iustinian, what so euer they be, I answer that he did those thinges as following the olde canons and rules of councelles before, deuising nothing him selfe, but by his lawes adding to them terrour, to cause them to be of all men the better obserued, or elles that what so euer he ordeined him selfe and put forth in his owne name, he did first communicate with the B. of Rome (as in the epistle before alleaged he promised he would) and procured it to be ratified by his auctoritie. And these answers I hope you haue hard by the Emperour him selfe in the places by me before alleaged, sufficientlie proved.

Nowell.

You do well to repete your Canonikes shittes againe in your conclusion: but you do will omitte the third skill, that godlie Princes doe make lawes to keape vngodlie priestes in some ordre and honestie of life.

Now whosoever considereth in Iustinian the Emperours lawes his great and chiefe authoritie, contri-

canon

AAAa

nuallie

nuallie shewed and declared by commaundinge, charging, permitting, forbiddinge, all Patriarkes, Archbishops, Bishops, &c. and amongst them the Bishop of Rome by name: and by vsing all other termes and woordes, possible to be vsed, for the moste effectuous declaration of his chiefe authoritie and gouernement ouer the saide persons, and matiers Ecclesiasticall, concerning the whiche the said lawes are by Iustinian made: and marketh howe he bzeaketh, and disannulth the ould coueteous customes of the cleargie by nue constitutions by him selfe made: and withhall noteth the pænalties by the saide Emperour appoynted vpon all Ecclesiasticall persons, that should transgresse his said lawes, wil easelie vnderstande, that Iustinian his chiefe authoritie, is nothing impaired nor hindered by his conference with Pope John, as with a learned man, for aduise sake, (not for any ratiffenge of the imperfall lawes by his authoritie, as G. Dozman and other Papistes doe lie) neither by his solowinge of the holie rules, that is to saie, of the holie Scriptures, nor of the former lawes, by the auncient Emperours his predecessors befoze made, nor of the holie Canons alwayes by the authoritie of Christian Princes confirmed and established. For what can these thinges moze hinder the chiefe authorite of the Emperour Iustinian, than it doeth hinder other godlie Christian Princes chiefe authoritie, or the chiefe authoritie of the highe counsell of Parlyament, that they doe solowe the holie Scriptures, or the good aduise of learned men, or the presidents of auncient lawes, in the making and settinge forth of nue constitutions, ordinaunces, or lawes:

Dorman. Fol. 49.

The substance and verie strength of our aduersaries reasons you haue hether to harde. There remaineth one or two testimonies mo, brought of late by M. Haddon in answer to the learned epistle of Hieronimus Osorius, as that S. Paule saith that euerie soule should be obedient to the higher powers: in whiche wordes they seye that neither Bishop Prieste nor Monke is excepted, and that S. Peter willeth all men to be subiect to euerie humane creature for Goddes sake, whether it be to the Kinge as to the chiefest and so furth. The whiche reasons (if reasons theie maye be called that consist of mere folie) because they are so childishe that euerie child may in a manner answer them, and so foolish he that he is more then a foole that is by them moued: as lothe to spende so muche time in vaine, or trouble your eares and eyes for nothing, I passe over.

Onelie this I saie, that euen as Priestes and all without exception, owe obedience to their Prince in those things that concerne his iurisdiction, I meane things temporall: so on the other side ment neither S. Peter nor S. Paule, to giue them any preeminence in matters ecclesiasticall. For in those things, they call as fast apon obedience to be exhibited towards the cleargie, namele S. Paule, who addeith the reason to be, for that thei are the watch men, which watche to giue the account for our soules. The whiche wordes can no more be vnderstande of ciuile magistrates (who could them full euell be called warchemen for other, being them selues fast a sleape and drowned as it were, in the dead sleape of infidelitie) than their other place of obedience towards the king, can be vnderstande of matters concerning religion. Vvhiche anie man that hath but halfe an eye maie easelie perceauie it can not, if he cast but a quarter therof to that time, in which S. Peter wrote those wordes: which was in the reigne of Nero, whom by all likelihood (being to Christ and his litlee stocke an utter enemy, and extreame persecutor) he would neuer make or name to be, (a cruel gredie, and rauen-

AAAA 2      noue

Rom. 13.

Cap. 2.

Hebr. 7.

nouse wolfe) the gouernor and leader of the meke and simple shepe. To bid them obeie him in matters of religion, had bene to bid them to disobeie Christe, to refuse him and cast him of. VVherefore that obedience must be restrayned, which it can be to no other things, then suche as onely consist in ciuile and politike gouernement.

No well.

Dor. sup. fo. 17. b  
I shal truly bring  
foorth, into the  
face of open court  
all such euidence  
of importaunce,  
as either parte  
hath to alleage  
for the selues, &c

I doubt nothing but the substance, and very strength, of all the reasons, that Papistes haue in this matter to alleage for the, by their proctor M. Dozman, here brought into the face of open Court, as he promised, do appeare to all the discreet readers, to be suche as are most meete for suche men and matters, and specially meetest of all others, for their trustie proctor M. Dozman: who now in the conclusion is determined to do a worke of supererogation, in confuting also of D. Haddon. And M. Dozman might in deede well haue passed over D. Haddon his reasons, seing his wisdome iudged them to consist of mere folie, and to be so childes hand folis he, that he is more than a fooler, that is by them moued. For the whiche causes though he saith, he will passe them ouer, yet notwithstanding his wisdome saith vnto the said reasons, all that his reason could serue him to say. And what phrase or figure of Rhetorike it is, that M. Dozman here vseth, I can not say. Now D. Haddons woordes touching this matter, are these. Euangeliū potestates distinguens, primam collocat autoritarem regalem; & subter eam reliquas subijcit, authoribus Petro & Paulo, quorū vos nominib⁹ ad Romanæ sedis regnum aburimini that is: The Gospel making a distinction of powers setteth the kingly authoritie in the chief place, and placeth other authorities vnder it, by the authorities of Peter and

ter and Paule, whose names you doe abuse to the maintenance of the kingdome of the Romaine see.

These are D. Haddons woordes: wherein I pray you what childishnes doth your grauitie finde? What folly and foolishnesse findeth your wisdome in them: Sure I am, no wyle man can finde in them any other thing than the very trathe: for certenly that whiche D. Haddon here saith, is to be founde in Peter and Paule. Chrysostome by S. Pauls woordes to the Romaines, saith, that neither Bishop, nor Prieste, nor Monke, is excepted from the obedience to the Prince. You may therefore, if it please you, & in dede you doe deride Chrysostomes childishnes, follie, and foolishnes rather than D. Haddons: whose woorthines can not by your vnwoorthie woordes be any thing blemished.

Rom. 13.

Tit. 3.

1. Petr. 2.

In Romanorum.

Now M. Dozman thinketh because Princes were Heathen and vnchristened whan S. Paule and S. Peter wrote those epistles, that obedience to Princes by them taught, is to be geuen to Christian Princes in no moe thinges, nor further than it was to be geuen to Pagan Princes, who reigned, whan they did write the said epistles. By the like reason a sroward childe might answer his father that would teach him the articles of his faith, that Honora patrem, was spoken when parentes for the mooste part were Pagans, and that therefore his father passeth his commission, to deale in suche matters. But M. Dozman, Gods lawe is not a law for certen daies, yeeres, or ages, but for all times. And if S. Paule and S. Peter willed all men without exception to obey Pagan Princes, muche moze it inforceth, y they shuld obey Christian Princes. You say, *that Princes than could full euill be called warche men for other*

Aaaa 3

being

being them selues fast a sleape, and drowned in the dead sleape of infidelitie. You say true: but bilike your Popes of Rome, (who are by your iudgement in al thinges to be obeted) were than broad waking: But if your Popes of Rome were then in as dead a sleape as the Emperours, and moze dead to, so; then they had no being, what scructh your reason against Christian Princes, whan God after did sende them, moze than it doeth against your Popes? As S. Paule and S. Peter expresse do commaunde all men to be obedient to the higher powers, and speciallie to the king, as the chiefe: had they in like manner said, let every soule be obedient to all Ecclesiastical gournours, and speciallie to the Popes of Rome, as to the chiefe, if we should haue made an exception to Popes, so; that they were vnknowen, and vnmete to be called watchemen, whan S. Paule and S. Peter so wrote, I beleaue you would quicklie replie, that Gods woord foreshewed of them to come, and bindeth men of all ages, by a perpetuall lawe, to obey them whan they come, and be in place. I praye you let vs haue the same reason at your handes so; Christian Princes, and let them, makinge lawes, and geuinge commaundement so; the maintenaunce of Christs Religion, be obeted, though Pagane Princes wold do no such thing: let not the goodnes of Christian Princes present, be binded by the naughtines of Pagane Princes passed, god M. Dozman. And if we can not haue this reason at your handes, I trust we shall haue it at moze reasonable mens handes.

Lib. 7. in proce-  
mio.

Socrates in his histoꝛie Ecclesiasticall hath these woordes. Ipsos quoq; Imperatores hac historia continua cõplectimur, propterea quod ab illis, posteaq; Christiani

Christiani esse cæperunt, res ecclesiasticæ pendent, & maximæ Synodi ex illorum sententia, & congregata sunt & congregantur. that is to saie: we doe in this continuall hystorie set forth the Emperours them selues also, because that Ecclesiasticall matters doe depend vpon them, after they once became Christians, and the greatest Synodes or counccils both haue ben, and are gathered according to their mind and determination. Thus saie Socrates: who though he would graunt vnto D. Dorman, that church matters depended not so much vpon Nero, in whose time S. Paule & S. Peter did write of obedience to Princes, yet affirmeth he, y after Princes were Christianed, Ecclesiasticall matters depended vpon them.

Now is S. Austen touching this mater, very plaine, August. epist. 156  
 who saith thus. Imperatores si in errore essent (quod absit) pro errore suo contra veritatem leges darent, per quas iusti & probarentur, & coronarentur, non faciendo quod illi iuberent, quia Deus prohiberet. &c. Quando autem Imperatores veritatem tenent, pro ipsa veritate contra errorem iubent, quod quisquis contemserit, ipse sibi iudicium acquirit. Nam & inter homines pænas luit, & apud Deum frontem non habebit, qui hoc facere noluit quod ei per cor Regis ipsa veritas iussit. &c. that is to saie: Emperours if they were in errors (which God forbidd) would make lawes for their error against the truth: whereby godly men might both be tried and crowned, by not doinge that which they should commaunde, because God forbiddeth it. But when Emperours hold the truth, they doe give commaundement for the truth it selfe against error, & which commaundement whosoever shall despise, he purchaseth to him selfe iudgement or danation thereby: for both he shall be punished amongst men, and shall not be  
 habile

Frontem non  
habebit.

hable to shew his face befoze God, who would not do  
that, whiche the truthe it selfe hath by the heart of the  
king commaunded him. Thus saire S. Augustine de-  
claring that though no obedience were to be geuen to  
Petro (in whose time S. Paule and S. Peter did write  
of obedience to Princes) commaunding wicked thinges  
against Gods commaundement, yet that obedience is  
to be geuen to godlie Emperours and Princes, commaun-  
ding for the truth in Ecclesiasticall matiers, (for of the  
he speaketh) according to Gods commaundement, and  
that whosoever doth disobey the godlie Prince so com-  
maunding, procureth to him dānation: for that in such  
cause the truth it selfe speaketh by the heart of the king.  
And what can be said moze for your Priestes, than is  
here by S. Austen said for Princes. If you would gather  
of those times, when S. Paule and S. Peter did write  
of obedience to Princes, who thā were wicked and un-  
godly, that vngodlie Princes are not to be obeyed in  
matiers Ecclesiasticall: I answer, no moze are vngod-  
lie Priestes: and I proue it by S. Peter, who writinge  
of obedience to Princes, disobeyed wicked Priestes,  
Annas, and Caiphas; commaunding against God.  
Said not S. Peter, it is better to obey God than man,  
euen to Priestes, and to the highe Prieste? And what  
can you say moze to wicked Princes, than said S. Pe-  
ter to wicked Priestes? And as we do graunt, that nei-  
ther Petro noz no Christian Prince is to be obeyed, if he  
shall commaunde against God: so dare you denie, but  
that neither Annas, noz Caiphas, noz other wicked  
Priestes are to be obeyed, if they shall commaunde a-  
gainst Christ: But as godlie Priestes are to be obeyed,  
teaching according to Gods commaundement, so are  
Christian

AA. 5.

Christia Princes likewise to be obeted making lawes, or geuing commaundementes according to Gods lawe and commaundement, in Ecclesiasticall matters by S. Augustines mynd. So that neither Priestes nor Princes, in that they be Priestes, or Princes, but in that they say or commaund lafull, and godlie thinges, are in matters ecclesiasticall to be obeted.

Where you doe graunt vnto vs, that Princes are to be obeted in ciuill and tempoꝛall matters, and thinges, of all persons, we thake you: you seeme to graunt your Popes vsurpation in taking ciuill dominion vpon him, and to agree herein with the ciuill lawe, whiche forbiddeth Priestes, and the Pope him selfe, intermedling in ciuill rule and dominio. But you doe scarce agree with your Canon lawe: in the bookes whereof you may find written, *Papa totius orbis obtinet principatum*, that the Pope hath the Princesdome of the whole world. And it is contrarie also to the exemptuous and immunities, which, Monkes, Fraters, Pionnes, and popish Priestes, doe claime from Princes iudgements and lawes, euen in most tempoꝛall & ciuill matters, as robberies, murders, & treasons. And it is cōtrarie to your maister D. Harding, who teacheth that the Pope may rule Temporallie, though a Prince may not rule spirituallie. I would wishe therefore, you would see your Canon lawe bookes mended, your licentious popish immunities restrained, and you D. Dozman to be frendlie aduertised.

Sext. Decretal.  
lib. 3. tit. 16. cap.  
Periculoso. in  
glosa.

D. Hard. Con.  
Apolog. fol. 395.

Dorman. Fol. 50.

Thus hauing I trust good readers satisfied both you and my promesse, it foloweth now that I shewe who is that Priest, that ought to be the head of Christes church here in earth.

¶ Bbb

No Well

Supra. fol. 15. b.

Your promise was to proue: That the head of Christes church here in earth must needs be a priest. Whiche your miserable proposition after you had once written it with great letters in the first fronte of your booke, you neuer after respected, or regarded, but leauinge it post alone vtterlie destitute and naked, you fall to prouinge that Priestes should haue knowlege to discern in matters of Religion, that they may instruct and teache the people, and direct them in scruples of their consciences, and deale in church matters, whiche was neuer denied to learned Priestes: and whiche appertaining to all learned Priestes aqualite, can proue no one Prieste to be head ouer al other. Your promise was to proue by iust consequence that neither Lay man, woman, nor child can be capable of the office, to be head of Christes Church here in earth. A woorthie promise, and well performed in prouinge that, whiche no man euer denied. And where you sille aspyringe from your promise, of prouinge of your head Prieste, ment to promise, and to proue that Christian Princes be not the chiefe gouernours in the Churches within their owne dominions, you leauinge that also, haue proued that Princes may not preache, not vse the power of the keies, or bynde and loose, not minister the Sacramentes, and take vpon them the execution of Priestes offices, as though these thinges needed ante proufes: as though any man had denied these thinges. The saynges of the ancient Doctours written against Princes that were Heretikes, and Di-rauntes, who by force oppressed the Church, and the truthe with it, you do malitiously heape together, and falslie applie to godlie Christian Princes, & speciallie to

Dor. fol. 15. 2.

our

our gracious soveraigne doctie doing her Princelie office in mainteining the truth, and being mosse mercifull, even to her mosse deadlie enemies. And being destitute of good testimonies, you do bringe in Pagans and Heathen Princes, Heretikes, Tyrantes, and Apostatas, witnesses mosse mete for your Pope, and you. And for lacke of ancient witnesses, you bringe in Basilus the Emperour, Leo Isaurus, Damascene, with others, farre without the compasse of yeares, whereunto, by promise, you do binde your selfe: and for like lacke of all antiquitie, you have filled a great part of your booke with John Caluins testimonies.

Dor. sup. fo. 23.  
24. Gallo, Aurelian, Theodoricus, Iulian.

Sup. fo. 23. 27. &c  
Dor. fol. 51. 2.

Sup. fo. 17. 19. 27.  
28. 29. &c.

And all these haue you by your accustomed arte, curtailed, depraved, and falsified, as I haue particularlie in their severall places declared.

Again, your promise was, that you wold trulie bring forth into the face of open court all such euidence of importance, as either part hath to alleage for them setues: so trulie you trust, that the counsell of the other side shall haue no cause to complaine, that either you haue suppressed or concealed their necessarie proofes one waie, or obscured their beaurie in bringing of them forth an other waie.

Dor. sup. fo. 17. b.

This is your promise also, The last part whereof (for I will speake first of it) you haue not trulie performed: for you pretending to haue chosen the reasons of the Apologie, as mosse pithie for our part, did onelie intend to abuse the great, and necessarie beaurie thereof, to occasions of continuall quarellinge with it, for omitting of certen circumstances, which you pretend are lacking, but the same in deede both being vnnecessarie, and also impossible to haue bene recorded in so great beaurtie. And yet haue you curtailed, mangled, and concealed the best part of the saide euidence, though but thortlie showed, and haue concealed in steed thereof,

your owne baggage, as our euidence, as I haue in the procelle of mine answere to you so dealing, at large declared: and so haue you geuen vs iust cause of complaint of the breache of your promise, and of your vnwright dealing in that behalfe.

In deede touching the first part of your promise, you haue well endenoured your selfe to perfozme it: for you toke it for a certaintie, that of al other writers of your side in these dayes, Hosius was the chiefe, and his reasons and allegatiōs of all other you iudged to be of most weightie impoztaunce. Wherefoze you haue wisely out of his answere to Bzentius, specially the second booke therof, intituled De Iudicibus ecclesiasticis, borrowed, may I say, or stoullen all this your treatie, without any altering at all, sauing onely the transposing of the places, by setting befoze in your booke, that whiche is after in Hosius, and contrariwise, in whiche facultie you are no simple artificer. And there was neuer since bookes were first witten, I trowe, anse one worke so miserable mangled, mengled, transposed, transuerted, peruerted, as is Hosius his answere made to B:ētius, speciallie y second booke thereof, here by you tossed, & turmoiled: neither haue you hereby yet obtained y whiche you sought, to keape your stealing secret. Pea & sometime also (as men of your occupation by vse of pikinge do) you war boulder in borrowing, and by whole handfulls take halfe a dosen Doctozs, and as manie or moe textes of the Scriptures together, in order as they dwlie in your Hosius. And in deed M. Dozman, had you, thus doing, simple professed your selfe to be a translator of Hosius his second booke (as you in deed are) as did your felow M. Shakerley of his first booke, though it had bene not so Bachelor like, but lasse to your honour,

hour, yet had it bene a great deale moze for your honor  
 & well, hauing Hosius on your side, were it by tra-  
 nation or other wise, you thinke you may safely saye,  
 that you haue performed your promesse, in bringing in all suche e-  
 uidence of importauce, as your side hath to alleage for you. For  
 what can your side say, that is of any importaunce, that  
 Hosius hath left vsaid? For, your Hosius is the Pa-  
 triarke of Papiſtes, and woꝛthely for his doings crea-  
 ted a Romaine Cardinall: all whose saynges and wy-  
 ttinges you English Papiſtes doe not only learne with-  
 out the booke, vt pueri magni dictata Magistri, as scho-  
 lers doe their maisters latins or lessōs, but also doe ther-  
 with stufte al your bookes, as many of you as doe take  
 pen in hand. But you M. Dormā doe farre passe al other  
 in bouldnes of borowling, for in comparison of you, that  
 Ctesopos chough, or facke daw, that chose and picked of  
 euerie bird a feather, to adourne him selfe withal, though  
 otherwise a ridiculous paterne of pꝛiule pickers, yet is  
 he in cōparison to you, decking your selfe with y<sup>e</sup> spoile  
 of one onelie Peacocks, very shamefull, & modest: which  
 Peacock, had he again al the gay feathers, that you haue  
 by whole handfulls, plucked out of his pꝛoud taile, he  
 shuld leaue you moze bare, thā euer was yet any bald  
 colt. And as you haue handled Hosius in this treatie,  
 so haue you vsed your maister M. Hardinge in y<sup>e</sup> residue  
 of your booke, of a part of whose booke, you haue with y<sup>e</sup>  
 great facultie, and gaine also made yours.

And yet you thus doinge, would seeme like to those  
 woꝛthie ancient wꝛiters, who tooke some benefite of  
 the bookes of sozmar authours: and you are not asha-  
 med in the defence of this your most manifest and sha-  
 melesse thefte & robberte, to make mention of Cicero,  
 Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle, whome you resemble

Dormā in the  
 preface of his  
 disproufe.

nothing so verre, as both Iacke a napes in his Jacket,  
 resemble a goodlie man comely apparelled. Yea, and  
 you doe accompt the most iust blaming of such your robe-  
 herte, to be the maintenance of a paradoxe, and straunge opinion,  
 suche as is meete onelie for Idiores and fooles to mainteine: & you  
 come in with *Nihil est dictum, quod non dictum prius*, for a  
 defense of your saynge the same, woorde for woorde,  
 whiche was so latelý befoze, both said, and wrytten also  
 by others, that if your memozte failed you to reherse it,  
 you might looke vpon the booke, and reade it: and by co-  
 pyeng of it out wholly, make vs an whole new booke, &  
 so become a wortbie wryter, and a famous authour, and  
 Godwill. And for that I chaunced to name you, & your  
 felowes, thus dealing, scélie translatours, you sumynge  
 therat, doe say: that so to thinke, is but a found coniecture, smo-  
 king out of mine idle braine. And you haue for an auenge,  
 in your smoking fume noted out of your late disprooue  
 of my booke an huge numbze of lies, even suche as is  
 this, that I called you scélie translatour, whiche you as  
 verelie are, as you are M. Dozman: vnlesse you thinke  
 I haue made a lie by diminution, where I moze truelle  
 might haue called you a shamefull, & shamelesse, rather  
 than a scélie translatour.

And though you charge my sojmar answer to you  
 with manie lies, (for what is moze easie, or vsual, to a  
 lier, than luynglie to say, that an other man lieth) yet  
 that I haue as trulle wrytten in the rest of the saide an-  
 swere to you, as I did in naming you a scélie transla-  
 tour, and in sayng I did answer Hostius (of whome  
 you haue bozowed all you haue in this treatie) rather  
 than you, the learned, who can iudge colours, and the  
 hue of lies, and trutthes, doe I doubt nothing alreadie  
 perceiue, and well knowe: and the vnlearned shall by

Gods grace shortly vnderstande the same, and w<sup>th</sup> that,  
 that in your saide disproufe there is nothing elles but  
 baine smokes, yole falses, and falsse fables, and in deede  
 a verie recantation of that, whiche you had befoze wri-  
 ten: as I shall in time conuenient make most manifest  
 to all that will vnderstande. Trustinge that in the  
 meane time, all reasonable mē will beare with me, in y  
 I do not in printed bookes, which can not be reuoked,  
 comitte my dolings to the v<sup>er</sup>e & iudgement of al sortes  
 of mē, learned & vnlearned, indifferēt & partial, friēdes  
 & foes, so sodenlie, and in such post pale, as do our En-  
 glish Papistes: who do seke onelie to scrue the pre-  
 sent time, and turne, and by haste sending abroade of  
 other mens woorkes, for their owne, to procure, or re-  
 teine, with their fauourers, credite, and an opinion of  
 great Clearkes, and to make a muster of manie bookes,  
 and a showe of readie defence & maintenaunce of these  
 popishe matters, the naughtines and falshood of the  
 whiche they knowe right well, that time the triar of  
 truthe will reuaille vnto the worlde. But their prayse  
 whiche by haste w<sup>ri</sup>ting, they purchase with their fa-  
 uourers, I inuile them not: my busines and age, is not  
 fitte nowe for suche post haste: neither is my minde  
 thereby either to hasterde my selfe, or to abuse others:  
 and I do looke rather for the deliberate allowance of  
 the discreate reader in due tyme, for w<sup>ri</sup>tinge trulle: thā  
 for the haste prayse of rashe iudges, for w<sup>ri</sup>tinge ty-  
 melie: knowing that the controuersies betweene vs,  
 and the Papistes, shall finallie be tried not by hastes  
 w<sup>ri</sup>ting, noz by multitude of bookes, but by the substā-  
 tiall and plaine settinge soozth of the truthe befoze the  
 eyes of those, that can (as I befoze said) iudge of the co-  
 lours & hues of truthe and falshood. And I doubt not  
 thing

thing but my dealing with *M. Dozman*, shall be a monument of the falshoode and impudencie of *Papistes*, when poperie shall be extinguished.

*Now M. Dozman* thinketh he hath quitte him selfe like a man, & saith that he hath removed, and tumbled blockes, and stumbling stones out of the waye, whereas in deede he hath done nothing els, but with the leauer of his translation tumbled such blockes & stumbling stones, as were by *Hosius* laide in latine mens waies, into the pathes of our countrey men: which any other euill willed lottering labourer in the *Popes* workes, might easely haue done, as wel as *M. Dozma*. And now sir, the ma is come vnto his principal poëct of the *Popes* supremacie ouer the church: which mischieuous block, & stumbling stone he will bring walking, with moze ease & speed by his maister *D. Harding* his prouision, than he did the other by *Hosius* his helpe. And will you see *M. Dozmas* profitable instructions of yong men, such as right well doe become such a Bachelor of Diuinitie: who not contented by the eraple and paterne of his former treatie, only to haue taught such as are a litle learned in y latine language, doth also by this treatie instruct such clerkes, as know only the English tongue, how they may both very timely, and with short studie, & small paines, become worthy writers, & famous authours: the one by translation out of latine bookes, the other by transposition of English bookes, & by the onely skill of y scheme & trope, whiche is termed *Hysteron proteron*: the vse of the whiche was neuer thoroughly known vntil *M. Dozma* became a writer.

And as I haue before declared *M. Dozmas* method in his handling of *Hosius*, in y former treatie, so am I by promes bidden to set forth y forme of his dealing w *D. Harding*, in the residue of this his booke.

A forme

*Dorm. fol. 70. b.*

*Famoli,*

A soyme of M. Dormans Methode, and disposition, or rather misposition of the matiers contained in his Maister D. Hardings booke, which was printed a fewe wekes, befoze this his booke came abrode. With the Bishop of Sarisburie his answeare to them bothe.

¶ <i>Authorities and places of the Doctors and Councelles.</i>	¶ <i>Alleged by M. Dorman in his 3. parte, and firste principall Article.</i>	¶ <i>Borrowed of his Maister D. Hardinge out of his fourth Article.</i>	¶ <i>Answered by the B. of Sarisburie in his replie to Maister Hard. his 4. Article.</i>
¶ The treatie, that S. Peter was called head of Christes Church, and so obsequently, that that title belongeth to the Pope.	Is prosecuted by M. Dormā in the foure first leaves, that is, fol. 51. 52. 53. 54.	In three of his last leaves, of that treatie. that is, fol. 91. 92. 93.	In the Diuisiō. 31. pag. 301. 302. 303. &c. and Diuisiō 32. pag. 307. 308. &c.
¶ S. Augustine, sermon. 124. de tempore.	Dorm. fol. 51. b.	Hard. fol. 93. b.	Sarū. Art. 4. Diuif. 32. pa. 307. 309. &c.
¶ Chrysofom. Homil. in Math. 55.	Dorm. fol. 52. a.	Hard. fol. 93. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 32. pag. 307. 308. &c.
¶ Athanas <sup>s</sup> with other Bishoppes of Egypt, Thebaida and Libia.	Dorm. fol. 55. b.	Hard. fol. 76. b. 77. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 6. Pag. 231. 232. &c.
¶ Nicene coucell falsely in Athanas <sup>s</sup> name alleaged.	Dorm. fol. 56. a.	Hard. fol. 78. a. b.	Sarū. Ibidem.
¶ S. Ambrose in 1. Tim. 3.	Dorm. fol. 56. b.	Hard. fol. 92. a. b.	Sarū. Diuif. 31. pag. 301. 302. &c.
¶ S. Augustine Ad Bonifacium contra duas epist. Pelagian. lib. 1. cap. 1. And againe S. Augustine lib. 2. de baptismo contra Donatistas.	Dorm. fol. 56. b.	Hard. fol. 80. a. b.	Sarū. Diuif. 14. pag. 248. &c.
¶ Theodoritus epistola ad Leonem.	Dorm. fol. 56. b. 57. a.	Hard. fol. 81. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 16. pag. 252. &c.
¶ Irenæus lib. 3. cap. 3.	Dorm. 57. a.	Hard. fol. 79. b.	Sarū. Diu. 9. pa. 245.
¶ Ambrose de uocatione Gençium.	Dorm 57. a.	Hard. fol. 80. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 13. pag. 247. S. Augu.

A REPROVE OF M.

Authorities and places of Doctors and Councelles.	Alleged by M. Dorman.	Borrowed of D. Hardinge.	Answered by the B <sup>is</sup> of Sa- rum.
¶ S. Augustine epistola. 362.	Dorm. 57. a.	Hard. 80. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 14. pag. 248. &c.
¶ Chryostome epistola ad Innocentium Tomo 5.	Dorm. 58. a.	Hard. 84. b. 85. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 21. pag. 264. &c.
¶ Innocētius B. of Rome excōmunicatiō of Archā- dius the Emperour.	Dorm. 58. b. 59. a.	Hard. 87. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 24. pag. 279. 280. &c.
¶ S. Augustine lib. 1. cōtra epist. duas pelāg. ad Bōni- facium. againe.	Dorm. 60. a.	Hard. 80. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 14. pag. 248.
¶ Theodorus epistola ad Leonem. againe.	Dorm. 60. b.	Hard. 81. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 16. pag. 252. &c.
¶ Appeales made to the B. of Rome.	Dorm. 61. a.	Hard. 83. b. 84. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 20. pag. 260. 261. &c.
¶ Councelles not to be houlden, nor B <sup>is</sup> hoppers condemned without the licence of the Pope.	Dorm. 61. a.	Hard. 84. a. 85. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 20. pag. 261. & Diuif. 26. pag. 284. &c.
¶ Nicene councill falsely alleged in Athanasius his name, againe.	Dorm. 61. a. b.	Hard. 78. a. b.	Sarū. Diuif. 6. pag. 231. 231. 1. &c.
¶ Excōmunication of Bis f hoppers offending by the B. of Rome.	Dorm. 61. b.	Hard. 84. a. 87. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 10. pag. 261. &c. & Diuif. 24 pag. 279. 280. &c.
¶ Coucell of Ephesus, and Cyrillus as the Popes de- putie there, alleged.	Dorm. 61. b.	Hard. 88. b.	Sarū. Diuif. 26. pag. 284. & pa. 309. ver- s <sup>o</sup> finē de Cyrillo.
¶ Calcedonense Coucell. 62. a.	Dorm. 61. b. 62. a.	Hard. 79. a. 87. a. 88. b. 90. b.	Sarū. Diuif. 7. pag. 240. & Diuif. 26. pag. 286. & Diuif. 30 pag. 295. 296. &c.
¶ The Coucell of Nice falsely alleged yet againe, in Athanasius his name.	Dorm. 62. a. b.	Hard. 78. a. b.	Sarū. Diuif. 6. pag. 231. 32. &c.

Anacle

¶ Authorities and places of Doctors and Counnelles.	Alleged by M. Dorman.	Borrowed of D. Hardinge.	Answered by the B. of Sa- rum.
¶ Anacletus and Clemens with other very good e- vidence.	Dorm. 63. a. b.	Hard. 75. b.	Sarū. Diuif. 3. pag. 222. &c.
¶ Restitutions of Bishops by Popes, Athanasius to Alexandria, Paulus to Co- stantinople. &c.	Dorm. 64. b.	Hard. 89. 2.	Sarū Diuif. 27. pag. 287. & 288.
¶ The Bishop of Romes Delegates, Comissioners, and Vicars.	Dorm. 64. b.	Hard. 86. b. 87. a.	Sarū. Diuif. 29. pag 277. & 278.
¶ S. Gregorie.	Dorm. 64. b. 65. & 66. per totum.	Hard. 76. 2.	Sarū. Diuif 4. pag. 224. 225. &c. pag. 234.

And so as M. Dorman beganne his treatie with the  
prouse that s. Peter was called head of the Church, which is co-  
teined in thzee of D. Hardinges last leaues: so doth he  
end his treatie with S. Gregorie in his tow last leaues,  
which is in the beginning, and seconde leafe of D. Har-  
dinges treatie. And thus you see M. Dorman his Me-  
thode standeth whollie in the Scheme and trope which  
is termed hysteron proteron. The fourth Article  
with D. Harding is the first with M. Dorman, and the  
first with D. Hardinge is the fourth with M. Dorman.  
The proufes are by like arte disposed. The first parte of  
his treatie, is the last with D. Hardinge: & the last part  
of his treatie is the first, and this hysteron proteron,  
as in his former treatie he vsed with Hosius continual-  
ly: so faileth he not, to keape the same with his Maister  
D. Hardinge thzoughout this whole treatie, makinge  
prima nouissima, & nouiss. prima, the first the last, &  
the last the firste continuallie: as the Reader that will

M. Dormans  
Methode.

marke the numbres of the leaues of his, & his maisters bookes, which I haue diligētly noted, shal wel perceiue. And as he hath vsed this fourth Article of his maister his booke, so hath he likewise vsed the other three Articles folowinge. His second Article is his maisters first, his thirde is his maisters seconde, and his fourth is his maisters first. And as y Articles, so also are the proufes the same that his maister hath, but yet disposed oz more truly transposed, oz if you will, misposed, by the same arte, & his owne peculiar proper trope hysteron proteron, as are the Articles, & as you haue an experimēt of y proufes of this his first & his maisters fourth Article!

If you now aske me, why I haue not answered these thinges at large, I answeare thei are already answered, & better than I can answeare them, & I haue shewed you where. If you list reade W. Dozmanns reasons, and haue not his booke, I haue tolde you how and where you may without your colte finde them in his maisters booke, so that one booke may serue you, in steede of tow. If you would be resolued concerninge his reasons, I haue shewed you where you may be satisfied, & better satisfied than by my writings, in the B. of Sarum his replie: & here I spare your purse againe, y you be not ouen to bte an other needeles booke. If W. Dozmann either to make a muster & shewe of many bookes of their parte, oz for his glorie, oz gaine, oz for all these together, woulde of a piece of his maisters booke, by transcription make an other nue booke, as bigge almost, as his maisters whole, & set it forth to the worlde as his owne, within so few weekes after the first printinge of his maisters booke: yet am I not of that opinion, but doe regarde how good, rather thā how many bookes be written

ten of

ten of our parte: and I haue litle delight in such gloste,  
small skill, and lesse likinge of such lucre, & least leasure  
of al to write worse againe, that which is befoze better  
wzitten: & by such meanes without all pittie, to my poze  
countremens purses, by causinge them to bie the same  
worse, which they haue already better: and whiche is  
more, without regard of the mispendinge of their good  
time, more precious than money, to occupie them about  
the readinge of thinges triflingly respeded, which they  
haue already read well wzitten.

But you will say there be some fewe thinges yet,  
whiche M. Dozman hath peculiar, not wzitten by his  
Maister, noz answered by the B. of Darum. There are  
in daede some such fewe thinges, but not so few, as foolish.  
And I thinke I should by answeringe that litle leude  
stusse, thynke here and there intermengled, incurre a  
greater blame by such bellication, and nipping of them  
here and there, where they are to be founde, than by vt-  
ter silence of them.

But I wil not yet keape silence so whollie, but that  
I wil name them, and in naming them, answer them  
so as may serue for such trifles, and may satisfie all rea-  
sonable Readers.

There are besides that plentie of borrowed wares,  
befoze named, these fewe and litle percelles piked elles  
wheare, by M. Dozman.

First, certaine prouises of Peter was at Rome, which Dorm. fol. 58  
we denie not, & therefore needeth no prouise, neither be-  
ing proued, needeth any answer. But how is it pro-  
ued I pray you: forsooth by Tertullian, S. Hierome,  
Optatus, and S. Augustine, all in order alleaged out  
of one lease of Hosius: that this parte also may not be Hof. li. 2. fol. 76

vnlike the reste:

Item other proufes of his Popes supzernacie by the  
 Dormā fol. 52. a. testimonies of Pope Leo, of Pope Innocētius, of Pas-  
 55. a. 62. b. 63. 64. chasinus, Lucentius, & other the Popes legates, as god  
 Hard. fol. 76. b. indifferent witnesses, whereas neither his Paister, nor  
 Dorm. fol. 63. b. he can dissemble the exception which is iustlie taken a-  
 gainst the testimonies of Popes, as vnlawfull witness-  
 ses in their owne causes.

Fol. 54. 55. a. 55. b. Item other proufes of his Popes supzernacie, by Vin-  
 centius Licinensis, and Iustinian the Emperour, both  
 beinge by him falsified. For whereas the one calleth  
 Rome the head of the worlde, the other calleth y<sup>e</sup> Church  
 of Rome the head & chiefe of all Churches, M. Dozman  
 in stæde of Rome, & the Church of Rome, hath put the  
 Bishoppe of Rome, making him the head of the worlde,  
 and of al Churches: which was neuer w<sup>r</sup>iten nor ment  
 by Vincentius, or Iustinian.

Fol. 57. b. Item proufes of his Popes supzernacie by confessi-  
 ons & edictes of Constantinus, whiche are falsely four-  
 ged in his name, as are likewise the epistles to Marcus  
 Liberius, and Felix, Popes of Rome, most shamelesly  
 counterfeit in the names of Athanasius & the Bishops  
 of Egypt, Thebaida, and Lybia: as is largelie & plainely  
 Artic. 4. Diu. 6. of the B. of Sarum declared, & proued: with the whiche  
 pag. 231. 232. & c. forged fables yet, as though it were with god euidēce,  
 Dorm. fol. 55. b. often for lacke of better stufte repeted, both M. Dozmā,  
 56. a. 61. a. b. 62. and his Paister D. Hardinge would boultter by their  
 a. b. Popes vsurped tyzanie. And it is very god reason, that  
 Hard. 76. b. 77. a. such buildinge should with such buttresses and pillers,  
 78. a. b. be staled and vpholden: to saue the Romish vsurpar fro  
 vtter ruine, now imminent, as longe yet, as possible  
 may be, by such sealie thiftes, as popithe wittes can in-  
 uente

wente and deuise: but neither do suche trifles néede any  
answeare, neither haue I the leysure that hath *D.* Doz-  
man, to answeare thinges alreadie answered, and to  
write againe, that was befoze better wryten: neither  
liste I seeke either gayne or fame by thrustinge of other  
mers wozkes into the woꝛlde for mine owne: as is *D.*  
*D.*mans delight to do.

FINIS.

*¶ Imprinted and allowed accordinge to the order set  
foorth in the Queenes Maiesties  
Iniunctions.*

The first of these is the fact that the  
 country is now a free market for  
 the world. The second is the fact  
 that the country is now a free  
 market for the world. The third  
 is the fact that the country is  
 now a free market for the world.

FINIS

Published by the  
 American  
 Association











